The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XX. *March, 1914.* *No. 3.*

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonit, c. 6.*

Published by

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Washington, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XX. *March, 1914.* *No. 3.*

CONSTANTINOPLE AND CIVILIZATION.

Constantine the Great was in two senses the founder of a New Rome. He gave the Roman Empire a new constitution and a new capital. He began the transformation of pagan Rome into a Christian state, and he set up a Christian city on the Bosphorus to take the place of the pagan city on the Tiber. The glorious architectural creation which bears his name was the concrete symbol of the other Rome which had come into being through his reforms—political, social and religious. The city of new Rome could not have met the exigencies of the situation it was created to cope with, nor could it have long survived its creator, had not a new spirit of order, of justice and of law been infused into the decaying institutions of the old Empire. Constantinople, the New Rome, was the embodiment of the ideas of government and administration which Constantine, among the rulers of men, was the first to make effective. It was an answer to the failures of the past and a challenge to the unrevealed riddles of the future. The career of Constantine the Great brought to a close one period in universal history. With him ended the ancient world. When he made the fundamental law and principle of the Christian religion—the law of universal love and brotherhood—operative as a principle of statesmanship and politics, human affairs entered on a new stage of progress and civilization. By a strange

coincidence, the city which he established passed from the hands of the last of the Constantines when another great epoch in the affairs of men was drawing to an end. When Constantinople fell, the mediæval age, the age of faith, was already passing away.

The great and flourishing period in the history of Constantinople lies between these two dates, between the first and the last of the Constantines. It links the modern with the ancient world. Within its walls was preserved in large measure the civilization, the intellectual riches, the wisdom, the literary and artistic traditions of the ancient world. These it guarded and hoarded through long periods, when barbarism and ignorance had become almost universal. For more than a thousand years Constantinople was in fact what it has become in the language of its conquerors, "The City," the home and the citadel of an earlier civilization.

To have founded such a city was worthy of the career of Constantine the Great. His life was the culmination and solution of the political evils of the ancient world and a triumph over the difficulties which had for three centuries proved insoluble to Roman statesmanship. When Constantine, on the death of his father, Constantius Chlorus, in 306, was acclaimed Augustus by the army in Gaul, there were six claimants for the imperial purple in the Roman dominions. Galerius, Severus, Maximian, Maxentius, Constantine and Maximinus each aimed at being the head of the Roman state, each with considerable right and justice on his side and each with armies to support his claims. The works of peace were neglected, the frontiers were undefended, and in every quarter of the Empire Roman swords were turned against Roman hearts. On only one point were these rival rulers, with the exception of Constantine, agreed; they were united only in their common purpose to eradicate the Christian religion. With all the resources afforded by imperial administration, with cold-blooded implacability and untiring malignity, they hunted down the Confessors of Christ and offered them the alternative of apostasy or torture and death. Such a situation was not new. In varying forms

and with different degrees of intensity it had constantly recurred for nearly three centuries. From other causes in these three centuries the stability of the Empire was being weakened, discipline was becoming more lax and the strength and resources of the state diminishing to such a degree that final disruption and dissolution could not be long averted. Desperate as the situation was and fatal to the continued existence of Roman institutions, the danger lay not so much in the existing anarchy and disorder as in the fact that no maxim of government or administration, no known tradition of law or politics, offered any hope for remedy or redress.

The slow process of disintegration through which the Roman state was passing, and the threatened annihilation of Roman institutions, were directly traceable to two causes—the political theory on which the state rested and the political practice by which it was governed. In regard to the first of these, the Roman, like every state in antiquity, was theoretically a collectivist theocratic organization, based on a principle of extreme state absolutism, an intolerant spirit of nationalism and a regime of crushing despotism. Individual liberty was unheard of. The citizen belonged absolutely to the state. All his activities—social, intellectual and religious—were subject to the collective will of the city or nation to which he belonged. This doctrine of state control was first challenged by the followers of Christ. They dared to assert that in his relations with his Creator a man was free; that in the region of conscience the state had no competence, and that men, wherever found, because of their possession of an immortal soul and through the redemptive death of Christ, were brothers. The spread of these Christian ideas, and the attempts on the part of the Roman authorities to suppress them, make up the first three centuries of Christian history. It took Roman statesmen a long time to learn what the diffusion of Christianity meant to the Roman state or to any state based on the pagan idea of life and destiny, it took them years to discover that the Christian religion was incompatible with state absolutism, but, having discovered it, they spared no effort nor shrank from no cruelty in defense of the old spirit of domination.

The second cause of Roman decay and disorder was constitutional. It arose from the attempt to translate into practical politics this theory of state absolutism. Through a slow process of centralization all the power in the state was gradually lodged in the hands of one man, and the Emperor became the source of all law, honor and authority. Despotism must rest on force. In the Roman state force was represented by the army, and he who could count on the fidelity of the soldiers could wear the purple. The great mass of the people, especially the wealthy and influential classes at Rome, were, however, as little disposed to be governed from a camp as the soldiers were to receive orders from the palace. Had a military leader been able to withdraw the legions from the frontiers to the capital he might have dwelt in peace; but Rome's record of conquest and cruelty, the hoarded treasures of many lands in her rich cities were drawing each year increasing hordes of enemies and barbarians to her frontiers, and her only safety lay in the skill of her generals and the bravery of her troops. Emperor after Emperor was set up and cast down by one or other of the opposing factions. The Senatorial party had had its representatives in the persons of Caracalla, Elagabalus, Alexander Severus, and the Gordians. The military party triumphed when Septimius Severus, Maximinus Thrax, Decius and others ascended the throne. In all these conflicts the State was weakened, order and discipline vanished, and the enemies from outside became bolder and more insistent year by year.

Throughout the long period of anarchy and disorder between the era of the Antonines and the triumph of Constantine, only two among the Roman statesmen evolved theories of administration capable of coping, in all its phases, with the desperate situation of the Empire. Decius, a soldier trained in the camps, came to the throne in the middle of the third century. He proposed to restore Roman absolutism and to put an end to the spirit of faction and disorder by remaining in the camp himself, and providing for the execution of the affairs of government at the Capital by reviving the old office of Censor. Both projects failed. He himself was killed in battle and without

the support of arms the Censor was powerless. Faction and anarchy revived and for nearly half a century Rome was the prey of adventurers from within and of invaders from without. Another soldier Emperor, Diocletian, came to the throne towards the end of the third century. He conceived the idea of dividing the supreme authority between four rulers with coordinate powers, two with the title of Augustus, two with that of Cæsar. For nearly twenty years this scheme worked well in giving the Empire protection from her enemies. The government was administered not from Rome but from four frontier garrisons, Nicomedia, Sirmium, Milan and Trier. Diocletian was satisfied with having solved the question of defence, but his scheme failed in as much as it had not taken into account the maintenance of that theory of government, State absolutism, which alone was comprehensible to the pagan mind. Against his better judgment he allowed himself to be persuaded by his colleague Galerius to issue a decree of extermination against the Christians. The war of proscription and punishment against the followers of Christ was renewed with a degree of bitterness and cruelty unheard of before. How that war, had it been pursued to the end, might have resulted, can never be known. It ended because the constitutional expedient of setting up four rulers instead of one, had the fatal flaw of making no feasible provision for regular and orderly succession to the purple. Diocletian himself retired from the throne. His colleague Maximian was induced to do the same. Their withdrawal brought several candidates for the purple into the field and all the old problems presented themselves afresh with greater intensity than ever.

It was at this juncture that Constantine first appeared as an active figure in Roman politics. Through the choice and election of the soldiers he took his father's place in Gaul as Cæsar and subsequently as Augustus, and commenced the series of reforms and victories which made him sole ruler in Rome. Though the Edict of persecution against the Christians issued by Diocletian was still in force, Constantine refused to execute it in that portion of the Roman dominions subject to his juris-

diction. He was drawn more and more into the struggle between the various claimants for the purple. His first notable victory was at the Milvian Bridge near Rome (on October 28, 312) when he overwhelmed the forces of Maxentius and thus made himself practically master of the western half of the Empire. In the following spring he took a step which no ruler before him had dreamt of, a step which fundamentally changed the relation of the citizen to the State and of the individual to society. After a conference with his colleague Licinius he published at Milan early in the year 313 an "Edict of Toleration" by which the Christians were granted the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. "And," he proclaimed in the Edict, "since freedom and full liberty are granted to the Christians to observe their own religion, liberty is granted to others also who may wish to follow their own observances: it being clearly in accordance with the tranquility of our times that each one should have the liberty of choosing and worshipping whatever deity he pleases."

This Edict of Constantine was the first attempt on the part of any legislator to enact a law guaranteeing to men liberty of conscience. It was a complete renunciation of the theory that the State and its religion were one, it was the adoption of a principle first enunciated by the Founder of Christianity that there were spheres of human activity independent of State supervision and control, and as a maxim of practical politics it meant that the theory of State absolutism had been abrogated. Freedom of conscience, the separation of State and religion, the doctrine that no earthly authority should stand between the soul and God, was the cause for which the Christian martyrs and confessors had striven and suffered, and in writing this doctrine into the organic law of Rome, Constantine brought to an end the system of civilization which had prevailed in pagan antiquity, and established a new order of civilization as represented by Roman institutions on a basis distinctively Christian. Thus at one stroke he removed one of the sources of Roman decline. He gave Rome a new constitution. He borrowed from the Christians a principle for which they had so long con-

tended, and in so doing inflicted no injustice on their enemies, and conferred a lasting benefit on the State and humanity.

More than ten years elapsed before Constantine was in a position to deal with the other critical question in Roman politics, how to administer the regular affairs of the government and at the same time to provide for the defence of Rome against attacks from outside. He did not become sole ruler until after the death of his brother-in-law and colleague Licinius in 324. Then it was that the question arose of deciding from what place in the Empire the affairs of government and national protection might be most successfully administered. The old city of Rome had long ceased to be a place of strategical importance. It had ceased to furnish to the Empire soldiers or statesmen, and the manner of life of its inhabitants was repulsive to a man of Constantine's active and austere nature. He had the soldier's instinct for finding the spot which would place his enemies at the greatest disadvantage and contribute most materially to the success and prosperity of the Empire. For some time the eastern and western sections of the Empire had been drawing apart, and he naturally sought a point from which both might be controlled, some place on the border line between Europe and Asia. This locality where two continents meet was one where nature had been lavish with her gifts, and was rich in historical association and tradition. Many places could be chosen worthy to be the site for the throne of a man who was ruler of Europe and Asia. Constantine himself could not shake off the spell of classic tradition and thought of establishing the new Rome on the site of the ancient Troy. He considered the claims of Sardica with all its advantages from the soldier's point of view, but finally decided that the new Rome should rise where then stood the insignificant city of Byzantium. All who have visited Constantinople are agreed that no spot in the world is better designed by nature to be a great city and the capital of a great State. According to the story told by Strabo the city of Byzantium was founded by a colony of Greeks from Megara who, under the leadership of Byzas, were in search of a new home, and who, not knowing where to settle, consulted the Delphic oracle

and received answer to establish their State opposite to that of the Blind Men. This answer meant nothing to them until they saw the Golden Horn and what is now called Seraglio Point. Then all was clear, and they knew those who settled east of the strait must have been blind not to have chosen the European side.

The site of Byzantium, the place chosen to be the new Rome, is a promotory at the southwest point of the Bosphorus where it joins the sea of Marmora. This promotory is surrounded on three sides, by the waters of the Golden Horn, the Bosphorus and the sea of Marmora. It rises abruptly from the waves and is constantly watered by the swift current which flows from the Black sea to the south. "As truly a city of the sea as any of the maritime cities of the West, it has the advantage of being raised aloft on a line of hills, towering high above the level waters of the Bosphorus. These hills are seven in number, not like the hills of old Rome, indistinctly and confusedly, but each following each in marked and august succession—each crowned even now, and probably crowned always, by magnificent buildings (mosques now, churches then) closing in the mass of verdure which gathers round the buildings of the palace on the extreme eastern point."

The old historians like to say that Constantine was guided by a preternatural vision in selecting this place as his capital. An eagle, it is said, flying from the opposite shore, marked the spot where the new Rome was to rise, and Constantine himself traced with his spear the boundaries of the city, going on, as he said, till "He who guides me stops." Nothing in the career of Constantine offers such enduring proof of his genius as the choice of a place for the new Rome. Other great cities, Alexandria, Madrid, St. Petersburg, Berlin, owe their greatness to the ambitions of conquerors and rulers, but none of them equals the new Rome and none has exerted an influence so constant and so permanent on the affairs of mankind.

It is needless to speak of the natural and political advantages of Constantinople. It is practically situated on two continents, capable of dominating both and impregnable against attack

from either. The progress of the old Rome to power and Empire was marked by the various steps by which she became mistress of the Mediterranean. From the harbor of new Rome her fleets could be sent out along the Mediterranean and the Black sea, and her armies could penetrate with equal facility into Europe, Asia or Africa. At Constantinople the ruler was in a position to deal with both sections of the Empire, Greek and Latin, to weld together peoples different in language, race, and ideals. "Two strong and natural causes," says Gibbon, "are alleged for the perfection of the model of new Rome. The royal founder reigned over the most illustrious nations of the globe; and in the accomplishment of his designs, the power of the Romans was combined with the art and science of the Greeks."

Judging by what was accomplished, Constantine, in planning his new city, was guided by two motives: to make of it a civil and military centre commensurate with the needs and character of Rome's political greatness, and at the same time so to direct its form and organization that it would be the expression and the stronghold of her Christianized political constitution. Very little was needed to make of the spot a stronghold in the strict sense of the word. "The cataclysm which had rent Europe and Asia apart had made of the shores of the Bosphorus sheer rocky walls that defied assault. A strong wall on the land side completed this isolation. With a moderate garrison the ruler of Constantinople might scorn the forces of half the world."

To the natural and political advantages of the situation there was added all that the art, the science, the wealth and power of Rome could supply. Following the model of old Rome the city was divided into 14 quarters or wards and each was adorned with its appropriate public buildings. On the first hill which forms the point of the triangle and is bathed by the sea of Marmora, there was placed the Hippodrome, "an Olympus of bronze and marble, where the golden chariots flew before the eyes of the Emperors and the silk-clad people." Close by was the imperial palace, and the Palace of the Senators, and so with the other hills and the other quarters. They had their forums, their colonades, their palaces, their aqueducts, baths and cis-

terns. In spite of the sieges which Constantinople has endured, of the earthquakes and conflagrations from which she has suffered, some of the works of Constantine remain to the present, bearing mute witness to the glory of their founder.

No detail was overlooked which might add to the dignity or power of the new capital or contribute to the needs or the happiness of its inhabitants. Artists and engineers were summoned from all quarters of the Empire, a multitude of laborers toiled unceasingly in giving form and effect to their plans. The cities of Greece, of Asia, of Egypt, even Rome itself, were despoiled of their treasures of art and antiquity, of their statues of gods and heroes, of their trophies and their monuments. Constantinople was adorned, as St. Jerome said, by making all other cities bare. It became a great museum, and each appropriate space in the Forum, the Hippodrome or the Colonades had its fitting artistic or historic treasure.

In two important features the city of Constantinople differed from all other cities which owed their origin to Roman genius or initiative. It had no temples and no arena for human slaughter. Only during the short period that Julian the Apostate reigned did the smoke of sacrifice ascend from pagan altars within its walls, and it never saw the brutal spectacles of the Colosseum or the amphitheatre. The city was Christian, not pagan. Instead of the statues and the obscene symbols of heathen divinities the cross was set up. The symbol of man's redemption appeared everywhere. It appeared graven on the walls or in the buildings, or raised aloft on the streets. "Indeed," says Eusebius, "so large a measure of divine love possessed the Emperor's soul that in the principal apartment of the imperial palace itself, on a vast tablet displayed in the centre of its gold-covered panelled ceiling, he caused the symbol of our Saviour's Passion to be fixed, composed of a variety of precious stones inwrought with gold. This symbol he seemed to have intended to be, as it were, the safe-guard of the Empire itself."

If Constantinople had no temples nor altars for pagan sacrifices, it had churches. All were built in the same style, but not

with the same magnificence. A description of the Church of the Holy Apostles will serve for all. "This building he carried to a vast height, and brilliantly decorated by encasing it from foundation to the roof with marble slabs of various colors. He also formed the inner roof of finely fretted work, and overlaid it throughout with gold. The external covering which protected the building from rain was of copper instead of tiles, and this, too, was splendidly and profusely adorned with gold, and reflected the sun's rays with a brilliancy which dazzled the distant beholder. The dome was entirely encompassed by a finely carved tracery, wrought in brass and gold." This was the church designated by Constantine for his last resting place. Here, too, many of the rulers of the Empire were laid, and it became in time the Westminster or the St. Denis of the Eastern Empire.

It is not necessary to speak of the manner in which Constantine provided inhabitants for the new city; of the rights, immunities and privileges he conferred on them; of the devices he employed to draw from old Rome some of its Senatorial and patrician families. In all this he succeeded. The lines of the great imperial highways and post roads were changed, and what has been true of old regarding the first Rome, was true now of the second—all roads led to Rome.

The actual time employed on the construction of the city from its inception to its dedication was six years. The work of building and construction was then by no means complete, but sufficient was accomplished to enable the founder to dedicate his new capital to the God of the Martyrs. No more appropriate dedication could be conceived. It was the courage and the constancy of the martyrs through three centuries that had finally wrung from Roman statesmanship the boon of freedom of conscience, and it was by writing this grant into the legislation of Rome that Constantine had given to the Empire peace and tranquility.

This, then, was the city of Constantine, the jewel of the Bosphorus, situated at a point where continents and different races of men meet. It was the embodiment of the new Rome which

had arisen from the decay of the old. In it were comprised the best of what the Rome of the Cæsars had stood for in the past, and much of what the Rome of the Christians promised for the future. Its foundation, its plan and its purpose were the work of one man. To have founded such a city would alone entitle any ruler to be ranked among the great, but the city was merely the complement of the constitution. When Constantine published his decree of Toleration in favor of the Christians he changed the whole current of Roman destiny, when he established his new capital he gave the principle on which that change rested a fixed abiding place, an outward symbol, and an illimitable theatre of action.

To attempt to describe how the new Rome fulfilled the purpose of its founder would be to recount the history of civilization for a thousand years. Thrones rose and fell in that time, ignorance and barbarism smothered old civilizations, wars, famine and destruction traced their fatal course, new races appeared and vanished. Europe, Asia and Africa poured swarm after swarm of invaders and destroyers into those countries around the Mediterranean basin which had been the seat of the old civilization and the centres of culture and progress. In the midst of destruction, of war, of invasion and ignorance, Constantinople retained its place inviolable and impregnable. If the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Alani, the Franks, the Vandals and the Ostrogoths possessed themselves of the flourishing cities and fair fields of Italy, Spain, Gaul and Africa, they may have dreamt but they never succeeded in possessing themselves of the city of Constantine. If these provinces and States of the old Empire were powerless before the onrush of the Teutons from the North, the power which swept the Vandal from the Mediterranean, which checked the Visigoth in Spain, and drove the Ostrogoth from Italy, was that which went forth from the city by the Bosphorus. The same generals and the same troops who won back the West to the unity of the Roman Empire, saved Europe from the swords and the civilization of the Persians. Time after time, in successive waves of invasion, new peoples appeared from the North and the East, and time after

time did they waste their forces and break their power dashing against the defenders of Constantinople. If Charles Martel broke the power of the Saracens in the West and drove the Moslems from the soil of France, it must not be forgotten that his contemporary, the third Leo, held the gate of Eastern Europe against all the forces which the Saracen power then at its height could muster. "Everyone knows about the exploit of the Frank," says Mr. Bury, "it is almost incredible how little is known of the Roman Emperor's defense of the greatest city of Christian Europe, in the quarter where the real danger lay." The same remarks might be made of the earlier siege of new Rome in the days of Constantine the Fourth, when the armies and armaments of Muaviah were driven back and the nations of the West acknowledged the greatness of the Roman Emperor.

On the Romans of Constantinople rested the task of defending Europe, and until the days of the Crusades, they defended it alone. While the Empire of the Franks was gradually emerging from the chaos of the period of the wandering of the nations, its progress to order and civilization was made possible because its people could work at peace behind the bulwark of the new Rome. If Western chivalry responded to calls of distress in going to the defense of the sacred places in Palestine, their response was not less an act of faith than the payment of a debt which had been accumulating through centuries and the partial assumption of a burden which the Eastern Empire had so long carried unaided.

Thus in all the great political events which moulded and directed the fortunes of humanity for a thousand years in the great drama when Europe and Christianity were pitted against Asia and Africa and barbarism and infidelity, Constantinople fulfilled its destiny as the protector of civilization and religion, the guardian of law, and culture. Twenty-seven different times was it besieged and only twice before it fell a victim to the Turks was it captured. Its first conquerors were the soldiers of the Cross, the warriors of the Fourth Crusade who, in defiance of the excommunication of the Pope, and forgetful of their vows, sacked and pillaged this keystone of Christian influence.

The Latin Kingdom which they set up lasted less than sixty years, and the city was won again by its rightful masters. These events prepared the way for the last and final tragedy. Nothing in the history of Constantinople is more glorious than the story of her defeat. Surrounded by enemies, forsaken by friends, invested by an overwhelming army, the small garrison fought to the death, and the last of the Constantines died sword in hand. On May 29, 1453, Constantinople passed from the Cross to the Crescent. It became the home and the capital of a new people and a new religion, and as such it remains today. It was dethroned from its place in the vanguard of progress and civilization, and bound in the iron grip of fatalism, force, stagnation and sensuality as represented by the religion of the prophet.

It is not saying too much to assert that the calamity which over-whelmed Constantinople in the fifteenth century would never have occured had not its rulers in the fifth and sixth centuries departed from the spirit and purposes of the man who founded it. Constantine recognized the broad line of distinction between the civil and the spiritual, between the State and the Church. He proclaimed that the competence of the State did not extend to the affairs of conscience. His successors, notably Justinian, ignored the reform of Constantine and threw the world backward to the political theories of a Trajan or a Decius. The pagan ideal was revived and the Emperor came to consider himself master alike of Church and State. Cæsaro-Papism, the subjection of the Church to civil authority, laid the foundation for the final separation of the Eastern and Western branches of Christendom, and to this separation must unquestionably be attributed the fact that a successor of Mohammed now occupies the throne of the Cæsars.

It was not merely in the political sphere, however, that Constantinople was the leader and defender of Europe. Its influence was felt as much in the ecclesiastical as in the civil sphere. When the last great conflict between Christianity and Graeco-Roman paganism was fought out in the region of thought, and when the doctrines of the Christian religion were tested by the metaphysics of the Greeks, Constantinople was the centre of all

storms and controversies. It was in the city itself or within a comparatively short distance from it, that the first great oecumenical councils of the Church were held. Ever prone to find new doctrines or to question the old, the Christians of Constantinople, however, submitted to the dictation of a civil ruler in matters of conscience. Unwittingly they laid the foundation for bitted controversies among their descendants and raised up barriers which offer the most insuperable difficulties to the settlement of the eternal Balkan question.

Like all great cities and States, Constantinople had its periods of greatness and of decline. It suffered from domestic ills as well as from foreign foes, but it rendered an incalculable service to learning, to culture, and to art. In a period of universal anarchy and disorder Constantinople was the capital of a highly civilized State; it never lost the Roman tradition of order and administration, nor the Greek traditions of art and refinement. Other cities may have contributed to this result, but Constantinople was the literary and artistic as well as the civil capital of what remained of the Roman Empire. When the great memorials of the sages and the poets and the artists were suffering from the universal decay of the civil order in other portions of the world, Roman law, Greek literature, and Byzantine art were being cultivated and preserved under the protecting guidance of Constantinople. The wild-eyed fanatics who followed the successors of Mohammed out of the Arabian deserts fell under the spell of the civilization which they came to destroy, and the intellectual pre-eminence of Bagdad and Cordova are as directly traceable to the influences emanating from Constantinople as are many of the subsequent phases of the Renaissance in Western Europe. At a time when schools had disappeared from most parts of the world, and when blank ignorance had settled on the peoples who had made new nations within the bounds of the old Empire, the current of intellectual life was flowing on unbroken though diminished in Constantinople. Books, writing, painting, poetry, sculpture and architecture never ceased to be respected there. The Emperors were patrons of the arts and sciences, many of them were men of pro-

found learning, the patrons of scholars and scientists. Long before the great cathedrals of Europe were built or before the great universities were organized, Constantinople had been a centre for the diffusion of learning and enlightenment. It is no disgrace to the peoples of Western Europe that they did not earlier realize and develop their capabilities in the sphere of intellect and art, but it is very much to the undying glory of the city of Constantine that when this new thirst was awakened she had the means to satisfy it. It is not possible to estimate what part the East played in awakening the intellect of the West, but it is clear that that awakening could not have assumed the dimensions it did, had not Constantinople furnished the light and the guidance.

Nor was the influence of Constantinople in the thousand years of her supremacy confined to the political and the intellectual sphere. For many centuries the commerce of Europe was regulated from the Bosphorus. The business activities in which the merchants of Constantinople were engaged brought them into contact with nearly all the peoples of Europe. At a time when the economic sense of others had not yet awakened, and when none but the crudest and most primitive commercial relations were thought of, the coins of the Roman Emperors circulated throughout Europe.

In all, therefore, that concerns the higher things of life, the fundamentals of law, order and civilization, culture and religion, Constantinople held a place of pre-eminence for a thousand years. From that time in the fourth century when its walls rose beside the rapid waters of the Bosphorus, and when it was made the depository and guardian alike of the treasures of Greece and Rome, through a thousand years and more, Constantinople stood aloft, an organized State in the midst of disorder and anarchy, a home of culture in a sea of ignorance, a highly developed civilized community in a flood of barbarism. It maintained its place and its power by force of intellect rather than by force of arms. It was within certain restrictions the enduring embodiment of the life and purpose of Constantine.

Constantinople passed from œcumenical history when it be-

came the prey of the Turks. It gave them much but received little in return. It remains today a Christian captive in the hands of infidels. It is inconceivable that its destiny ended in the fifteenth century, and that its eleven centuries of usefulness are to be crowned with a slow death of inanition in Moslem hands. It is not without the bounds of possibility that changes may come. Constantinople is a European city. Its face is to the Orient. Its life may be renewed; it may once more be joined to the pulsing life behind, but it must have new masters. The happiness of a larger number of human beings, the fortunes of more nations, are bound up with the possession of that hilly promotory on the Bosphorus than with any spot on the habitable globe. Constantinople had its thousand years of glory, it has had its centuries of eclipse, but whether in glory or in eclipse, it remains and will remain the Gordian Knot of the world—the key to world politics.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

THE MINIMUM WAGE.

Legislative Aspects.

There is now pending before the Supreme Court of Oregon a suit instituted by a paper-box manufacturer of Portland to restrain the Industrial Commission of Oregon from enforcing an order of the Commission establishing a minimum wage for women workers, and asking that the legislation be declared unconstitutional.[1] The lower court had denied an injunction, and the case has been brought to the Supreme Court on appeal by the plaintiff. As this is the first time that the constitutionality of minimum wage legislation has been brought before the courts of the United States, the decision in the present case will be of wide-reaching influence, and is awaited with deep interest in every part of the country. Eight other states have passed minimum wage laws which have gone into effect during the past year and similar legislation is being mooted in practically every state of the Union. Needless to say, the decision in the Oregon case will vitally affect the movement for the regulation of wages throughout the country. It is the purpose of the present article to give a brief account of the legislation in question and to set forth some of the leading principles involved.

The regulation of wages has moved slowly in this country, owing to the interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, which guarantees that property shall not be taken without due process of law and that freedom of contract shall not be infringed. This was the issue raised when it was first proposed to limit the daily hours of work for women engaged in industrial pursuits, and it is noteworthy that it was

[1] In the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon. Frank C. Stettler, *Appellant, vs.* Edwin V. O'Hara, Bertha Moores, and Amedee M. Smith, constituting the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of Oregon, *Respondents.*

in an Oregon case that the limitations of this constitutional guarantee were pointed out by the Supreme Court and the constitutionality of the Oregon ten-hour law for women upheld. That decision is now the law of the land, and in view of the fact that the same fundamental reasoning is appealed to in defense of minimum wage legislation, we quote here the language of Justice Brewer, who delivered the opinion in the case of *Muller v. Oregon*, to which we are referring:

"That woman's physical structure and the performance of maternal functions place her at a disadvantage in the struggle for subsistence is obvious. This is especially true when the burdens of motherhood are upon her. Even when they are not, by abundant testimony of the medical fraternity, continuance for a long time on her feet at work, respecting this from day to day, tends to injurious effects upon the body, and, as healthy mothers are essential to vigorous offspring, the physical well-being of woman becomes an object of public interest and care in order to preserve the strength and vigor of the race."

This was the argument which warranted the court in upholding the constitutionality of a law restricting the daily hours of work for women, even though similar legislation could not be sustained for men. Justice Brewer continued:

"The limitations which this statute places upon her contractual powers, upon her right to agree with her employer as to the time she shall labor, are not imposed solely for her benefit, but also largely for the benefit of all. Many words cannot make this plainer. The two sexes differ in structural body, in the functions to be performed by each, in the amount of physical strength, in the capacity for long continued labor, particularly when done standing, the influence of vigorous health upon the future well-being of the race, the self-reliance which enables one to assert full rights, and in the capacity to maintain the struggle for subsistence. This difference justifies a difference in legislation and upholds that which is designed to compensate for some of the burdens which rest upon her."

It will be seen from the above citation that the limitation of the hours of men's labor in private employment is not held by the courts to come within the exercise of governmental power, and the limitation of women's hours of work is justified because

of the special structure and functions of woman. As we shall see, the establishment of a minimum wage scale for women in the United States will require the extension of precisely the same line of reasoning, and any attempt to make such legislation applicable to men would in all probability, at the present time, be held by our courts to be unconstitutional.

The constitutional obstacle to minimum wage legislation which exists in the United States is happily lacking in other countries. Since 1896 such legislation has been in operation in the State of Victoria, Australia, and in Great Britain since January, 1910. Some form of fixing legal minimum wages is also in operation in the other Australian states and New Zealand, and in all these cases the legislation applies equally to men and women. In Victoria, at the instance of either employers or employes, the Legislature may authorize the creation of a special wage board to fix a minimum wage for a given period. Both parties are equally represented upon such a board, and a non-partisan chairman is selected. Determinations, as the decisions of the special boards are called, if accepted by the Minister of Labor, are published in the Government Gazette and become the law for that trade. In regard to the operation of these wage boards, Victor Clark, who visited Victoria in 1903 and 1904 as a representative of the United States Department of Labor, states: "Property interests were not opposed to a statutory minimum wage. . . . The better employers rather courted some provision that freed them from the competition of the less scrupulous men of their own class."

In England, the wage boards, known as trade boards, are composed of representatives of employers and workers in equal numbers. Minimum wage orders determined by them apply to both men and women, and they may apply universally to the trade, or to any special process, or to any special class of workers, or to any special area. The act (9, *Edward VII, chap.* 22) went into effect the 1st of January, 1910, and has been applied to a large number of trades. "It is significant," says a recent writer, "that many employers welcomed the

establishment of trade boards, they confessing that it was only the stress of severe competition which caused them to give the low wages they had been paying, and arguing that if all were compelled to pay living wages none would be given an unfair advantage or placed at a disadvantage." Mr. E. F. Wise, of Toynbee Hall, London, writes in the *American Economic Review* for March, 1912: "There is every reason to be satisfied with the progress at present achieved. Already other trades are clamoring to be included. There is every indication that a weapon has been forged that will greatly diminish if it does not destroy one of the worst evils of our industrial system."

The movement for minimum wage legislation in the United States has been largely fostered by the Consumers' League. The international Conference of Consumers' League, held at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1908, outlined a definite program for the promotion of such legislation throughout the civilized world. This movement has been taken up in the various states of this country by the local Consumers' League, but it may be safely stated that its most effective impulse has come from the advocacy of Dr. John A. Ryan, of St. Paul. In May, 1911, the Legislature of Massachusetts adopted a resolution providing for the appointment by the Governor of a commission of five persons "to study the matter of the employment of women and minors and to report on the advisability of establishing a board or boards to which shall be referred inquiries as to the need and feasibility of fixing minimum rates of wages for women or minors in any industry." In the meantime, several other states became interested in this legislation, and commissions were created in California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Washington and Wisconsin. Of these, the first to become effective was that of Oregon, which began its operation on June 2, 1913. In Utah the Legislature proceeded on a different principle, and enacted a law fixing a flat minimum rate for experienced, adult women workers at $1.25 a day.

The Oregon wage legislation was drafted by a special committee of the Consumers' League of Oregon, which was

appointed in July, 1912, to make a survey of the wages and conditions of work among the women employes of the state and to formulate such legislation as would seem necessary to safeguard the health and welfare of women workers. The survey committee undertook a thorough investigation under the direction of Miss Caroline J. Gleason, who published an extensive report in January, 1913, "on the wages, hours and conditions of work, and cost and standards of living of women wage-earners in Oregon, with special reference to Portland." In this report were to be found schedules showing the occupational distribution of more than 8,700 women, giving an account of their wages, their cost of living and their conditions of work. It appeared from this report that 47 per cent. of the employes in department stores, 60 per cent. in factories, 76 per cent. in laundries and 37 per cent. of general office help (not including stenographers) were receiving less than $9 a week; whereas, it was the conclusion of the investigator that $10 a week is the minimum on which the average self-supporting woman could live decently and keep herself in health. It was obvious from these facts that the wages of working women were being determined purely by the law of supply and demand and with little reference either to their needs or to their producing power.

It was found that the wage schedules of women workers were guarded with the utmost secrecy so that there was no uniformity of compensation based on efficiency, time of service or type of employment. Also that the hours of labor were frequently excessive and the conditions of work detrimental to the health and morals of employes. To remedy this condition as far as possible was the purpose of the bill drafted by the survey committee and enacted into a law by the Oregon Legislature.

The principle of the act creating the Industrial Welfare Commission in Oregon, as far as it applies to wages, is set forth in Section 1 in the following language: "It shall be unlawful to employ women in any occupation within the State of Oregon for wages which are inadequate to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain them in health." Exception to this general

rule is permitted in the case of minors, learners and apprentices, and persons crippled by age or otherwise. The law requires that experienced, adult women shall receive at least a living wage.

The determination of what wages shall be considered adequate to supply the necessary cost of living devolves upon the Industrial Welfare Commission. The Commission, however, has no power or authority to fix arbitrarily the wage which shall be paid. The law provides for the calling of a conference of employers and employes, together with representatives of the public, and it is the duty of this conference to make recommendations to the Commission on the question involved. The conference is practically a board of arbitration, as both representatives of the employers and employes meet on equal footing to discuss a matter of interest to both. This method obviates the charge that the Commission might determine a wage without adequate information, for it will be to the interest of all parties in the conference to have the most thorough investigation before making recommendations.

On receiving the recommendations of such a conference the Commission reviews them and submits them to a public hearing after proper advertisement in the public press. At this public hearing all interested parties may appear before the Commission to show reason why the recommendations should or should not be made the subject of obligatory rulings. After the public hearing the Commission is authorized to reject the recommendations or to issue an order making them obligatory. Such an order goes into effect 60 days after it has been promulgated by the Commission.

Up to the present time the Commission has organized four conferences and has held public hearings on their recommendations. Three of these conferences referred to industries within the city of Portland and one to the industries in the State at large. The diversity of rulings for different occupations is in accordance with the spirit of the law which provides in Section 12 that " the Commission may make different orders when different conditions in the judgment of the conference and Com-

mission justify different recommendations." These differences are due to divergence in cost of living in different occupations and localities, and to conditions inherent in various industries which demand different rulings concerning the hours of employment.

The following orders have been issued for experienced adult women workers: First, in manufacturing establishments in Portland a minimum wage for experienced women has been fixed at $8.64 a week; 54 hours a week are the maximum hours of employment, and a 45-minute lunch period is required. Secondly, in mercantile establishments in Portland the minimum weekly wage, for experienced adult women, has been fixed at $9.25 a week, and the maximum hours at eight hours and 20 minutes a day and 50 hours a week. For office help in Portland the minimum wage is $9.25 a week and the maximum hours 51 hours a week. The above rulings apply to the city of Portland only, and to the occupations stated. The minimum wage requirement is for experienced adult women, and it has been ruled that not more than a year of employment in any occupation shall be required in order to become experienced in the sense of these rulings, namely, to be entitled to the minimum wage.

On December 9 rulings were made covering practically all industries in the State at large employing women and affecting such industries in Portland as had not been regulated by the previous orders of the Commission. These rulings, which will become effective February 9, 1914, provide that the minimum wage in all occupations throughout the State for experienced adult women workers shall be $8.25 a week; that the maximum hours shall be 54 hours a week; that the employment of women in manufacturing and mercantile establishments and laundries shall be prohibited after 8.30 p. m. of any day, and finally, that in no occupation shall more than a year's employment be required to become an experienced worker in the sense of these rulings. The minimum for inexperienced adult women workers employed at time rate is $6 a week. The above provisions apply directly to women employed at time rate only, but indirectly affect piece rates as the act provides that the minimum piece

rate must be so fixed as to supply workers of average ordinary ability the cost of living.

The results which may fairly be expected from a conservative administration of the act governing the Industrial Welfare Commission will be: First, the improvement of the condition of a large percentage of women workers; second, the promotion of harmony between employer and employes by their being brought together on the conferences and being permitted to see each other's problems and difficulties; third, increased efficiency among the employes; fourth, the elimination of unregulated and irresponsible wage scales which provoke intense hatred and antagonism between the working class and employers; fifth, the prevention of undercutting of prices by unscrupulous competitors who make up for their low prices by their exactions on their women employes.

As noted above, the Commission established a minimum wage of $8.64 a week (16 cents an hour for 54 hours) for women employed in manufacturing establishments in the city of Portland. Action was brought before Hon. T. J. Cleeton, of the Circuit Court of the County of Multnomah by Frank C. Stettler, a paper box manufacturer, asking a permanent restraining order against the Industrial Welfare Commission on the alleged ground that the legislative act creating the Commission is unconstitutional. Two important questions were raised: First, that the creation of a commission to determine wages was an attempt on the part of the legislature to delegate legislative power; and second, that it was in contravention of the State and Federal Constitution in that it deprives the employer of his property and his liberty to contract without due process of law. The first of these questions involves the mode of administering minimum wage legislation. As we have already noted, the State of Utah has passed an act fixing a flat minimum rate of daily wages in all industries. In fixing the rate by legislative enactment, the difficulty with which we are dealing is avoided, but the method has serious drawbacks which make it inadvisable. Among these disadvantages might be noted that the fixing of a flat minimum for all industries takes no account of diversity in the cost of living in different localities nor the fluctuation

in cost of living at different times. Foreign experience is altogether in favor of the determination of wages by boards or commissions, and of the nine American States enacting this legislation eight have adopted the commission type. Consequently the decision on the constitutionality of this mode of administration is of great importance. In considering this matter Judge Cleeton quoted the opinion rendered in a railroad commission case by Justice Moore, as follows:

> "The rule is universal that as a legislative assembly exercises an authority conferred by the Constitution, it cannot delegate the power to enact laws. It may, however, direct that the application of a statute to a designated district or to a specified state of fact, shall depend upon the existence of certain conditions to be ascertained and determined in a particular manner."

Judge Cleeton held that the Legislature had fixed the standard of wages in declaring that the wages should be sufficient to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain the workers in health, and that there was left to the Commission merely the administrative function of ascertaining the facts which, when determined and promulgated, should set in operation the statute.

In regard to the constitutionality of minimum wage legislation for women, the question resolves itself to this: Does the establishment of such a wage come within the police power of government? If it does, then the State has the power to limit the freedom of contract of women workers. The police power of the State has been set forth in broad terms by Justice Holmes. He says: "It may be said in a general way that the police power extends to all the public need. It may be put forth in aid of what may be sanctioned by usage or held by the prevailing morality or strong and preponderant opinion to be greatly and immediately necessary to the public welfare." (Noble State Bank *vs.* Haskell, 219 U. S. 104.) It is uniformly held by the courts that a woman's contractual freedom may be limited by law in regard to daily working hours. "To say that a woman shall not contract to work for less than at least a living wage is to go no farther than to say that she shall not

contract to work more than eight or ten hours, or under certain other unwholesome conditions which may affect her as the potential mother of future citizens. It is indeed much easier to trace a social connection between working for wages inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living than working more than eight or even ten hours a day." (Massachusetts Commission on Minimum Wage Boards, page 23.)

The only decision rendered by a court in the United States directly covering the question of minimum wage for women is that of Judge Cleeton, of the Circuit Court of Oregon, for Multnomah County. In his opinion in the case of the Oregon Industrial Welfare Commission already referred to, he deals with the matter in the following language:

"To make effective a law fixing maximum hours of labor it may become necessary to have a law fixing a minimum wage. The two are inseparably linked together. This is especially true in the case of the employment of women and children, for the reason that the occupations in which they may be usefully employed are necessarily limited, while the number seeking such employment is necessarily large. The two laws are necessary complements of each other and go to the same effect and to secure the same end. If the law regulating the number of hours of labor for women and minors is within the police power and constitutional, a law fixing a minimum wage is also within the police power."

The purpose of the act, continues Judge Cleeton, in limiting the maximum hours of labor and the minimum wage for women is evidently the same, viz.: to preserve and conserve their health and morals. Is the preservation and conservation of the health and morals of women workers a public concern, or is it merely a matter that concerns the individuals employed? If the enactment is for the public health, peace, morality and general welfare, it falls within the police power of the State to regulate. The complexity and intimate relations of our present-day civilization are such that there is a necessary dependency of the public welfare upon the health, morality and vigor of our women and children, when considered from physiological, sociological and moral standpoints.

"The women are and are to be the mothers of our future citizens, and when any considerable number of them are employed at wages which reduce them to beggary or denies a sufficient compensation to preserve health, the insufficiency of such wages becomes a powerful factor in determining the social, moral and physical status of the body politic, and is a matter of public concern."

After setting forth the above considerations, the Court observed that it is oftentimes difficult to determine where the boundary line should be drawn in the "twilight zone" of matters relating to the police power of the State. This zone is necessarily a widening one and must be and will be extended to new questions as they arise when those questions are dealing with public and general welfare; hence the limitation of the police power when applied to these matters, must necessarily be shifting, determined not so much by precedent as by reason and justice and the preservation of the public peace, health, morality and the general welfare.

"The statute having for its object the general welfare, it will be given a liberal construction. And considering the statute from that standpoint, it is my opinion that the regulation of the minimum wage for women and minors, as announced in the act, is within the police power of the State, and is, therefore, constitutional."

In the foregoing article we have attempted to outline only the legislative aspect of the minimum wage act. Within a month the decision of the Oregon Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the measure will probably be announced. If the decision is favorable, the writer will undertake in a subsequent article to set out for the readers of *The Bulletin* some of the economic problems involved in the practical administration of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

EDWIN V. O'HARA,
Chairman, Oregon Industrial Welfare Commission.

DRYDEN AS A PROSE WRITER.

In his private life and in his career as a writer, John Dryden was a many-sided man. His changes of opinion in matters political and religious have been the cause of undisguised embarrassment to more than one of his biographers, and the almost infinite variety of his writings was the most striking literary phenomenon of the second half of the seventeenth century in England. Here was truly a man who in his time played many parts.

Was there, indeed, any form of literary endeavor—with the exception of the then but slightly exploited prose romance—at which John Dryden did not try his hand? He commemorated in verse both the death of Oliver Cromwell and the accession of King Charles II; he enrolled himself among the metrical chroniclers with his record of a wonder year; he wrote poetry: lyric, narrative, elegiac, didactic, satirical, controversial; he translated poetry from the Greek, the Latin, the French, the early English; he constructed or adapted upward of 30 dramas; he compiled a life of St. Francis Xavier; he did his fair share in the then popular diversion of pamphleteering; he turned out countless prologues and epilogues; he grasped every occasion to invade the field of prose criticism. Certainly, whatever else may be thought of Dryden, he is to be neither feared nor dreaded as a man of one book.

And, what is still more remarkable, the poet laureate was no mere dabbler, no tentative experimenter in literary forms; he dominated in all. The Restoration drama was a poor thing at best, but such as it was, Dryden was its leading representative. There have been more appealing "church-yard poets" in English literature, but they were not of his day and generation. Of the English satirists, who—save Swift and possibly Pope—can be mentioned in the same breath with the author of "MacFlecknoe?" And Dryden engaged in cool appreciation rather

than in gratuitous boasting when he said of his "Alexander's Feast," "Nobody has written a nobler ode, and nobody ever will."

If today much that Dryden wrote possesses only an historical interest, it is largely because the vital flame has flickered out of most of the literature of the closing years of the seventeenth century. Pope was wont to ask, "Who now reads Cowley?" With no less pertinence may come the query, "Who now reads Waller, Congreve, Butler, Farquhar, Wycherley, Vanbrugh, Shadwell, Buckingham?" There exists just now a mild-mannered cult of the diarists Evelyn and Pepys, and Locke is of interest to students of philosophy; but with the exception of Herrick, who was not indigenous to the period and ranked himself a member of the Jonsonian "tribe of Ben," John Dryden is the only Restoration writer who still possesses a distinct and appreciable literary appeal. To the more discerning general reader, he is the author of a matchless ode; to the more superficial, he is only a name, but ever a name to conjure with.

In his own day Dryden, though distinguished in many fields, was held in highest esteem as a dramatist—a fact which reflects sadly enough upon both the decency and the discernment of the period; in the eighteenth century he was held in highest regard as the father of the heroic couplet and the master satirist in verse; and today attention has shifted to his prefaces and dedications which constitute a considerable body of literary and dramatic criticism and exemplify a great advance in the development of English prose. Dr. Johnson voiced the eighteenth century opinion of Dryden when he claimed that the laureate found English poetry of brick and left it of marble; but might not we today apply the figure with more propriety to Dryden's essays? There was plenty of great poetry before Dryden; but was there before his time a corresponding development of English prose? Bacon had set a needed example of sententiousness in his essays, but the possibilities of his style were sharply limited; Ben Jonson had striven in his "Timber" and "Underwoods" to make the most of a prose form that was neither flexible nor ripe; Sidney and Milton had painfully beaten out some

purple patches, the one in his "Arcadia" and "Defense of Poesy," the latter in a few of his polemical writings. But not till we reach Dryden do we find prose that we can read with ease and satisfaction. English prose has been long reaching its fulness of perfection, but it was under Dryden that it received a stimulus and direction that were availed of by Addison, Steele, Johnson and Swift in the eighteenth century, and that made possible the triumphs of the nineteenth century essayists. Arnold makes no mistake when he designates Dryden's essays, "The first pieces of good modern English prose."

It is conceivable that in his prose essays Dryden builded better than he knew. They were for the most part occasional writings aiming as setting forth some of the principles which he carried into practice in his other literary work and tending, in many instances successfully, to forestall unfriendly criticism of his plays and translations. Indeed, no adequate estimate of Dryden's essays can be made without a realization of the conditions under which they were written. In their entirety they constitute his literary apologia. They were not written in the aloofness of spirit characteristic of the professional critic and student of other men's books, but with the directness and unction of the versatile and sucessful writer who has tested his theories in books of his own and seeks to explain and defend them.

Another thing that must be taken into account in the reading of Dryden's essays is the fact that in them the author was less consciously literary than in his plays and poems. Thus it is that we learn more about Dryden the man from the essays than we do from the vast bulk of his other works. They are really open letters, devoid of the self-importance and the ludicrous sense of universal responsibility that characterize the modern letter to the press. It is not altogether fanciful to say that in his essays Dryden drops both his dramatist's buskin and his laureate's bays and assumes in their place something of the attitude of a wise and genial teacher who rambles occasionally in his lectures, who will now and then have his little joke, who smilingly admits the direction of his intellectual bias and who

feels so sure of himself and his audience that he can take liberties even with the immortals. Some readers of Dryden have been shocked at the things he says about Virgil and Shakespeare. They seemingly are unaware that Dryden's criticisms are frequently rendered in the spirit of friendly annoyance in which Stevenson said of Sir Walter Scott: "He was undoubtedly slovenly. He makes me long to box his ears—God bless him!"

Then, too, we must remember the influences that affected both his critical theories and his style. The ancient classics were still on their pedestal when Dryden studied them at Cambridge, and their impress lies on almost every page of the essays. The Restoration period was frankly a period of French imitation when French poets, dramatists and critics were quoted approvingly and imitated sedulously across the channel. And when we recall that among the French writers of the period were such men as Pascal, Bossuet and Fenelon, Corneille, Racine and Molière, Bossu, Rapin and Boileau, it is not difficult to understand how profoundly they affected the English dramatists and critics. Those censors of John Dryden who maintain that he was unduly influenced by Latin models and Gallican opinions would do well to take into account the literary fashions of the times in which he lived and wrote.

And they would do well also to bear in mind that Dryden was a professional writer. Whatever else his Protean accomplishments did for him, they gave him an outlook invaluable for a critic. If he set down in his essays his opinions concerning the question of rime versus blank verse in the drama, he wrote, not merely as one who had read plays in both styles, but as a practical dramatist who had made ample experiments in the one and in the other. If, as in his "Essay of Dramatic Poesy," he sought to justify the alternation of comic and tragic scenes, he merited a respectful hearing because he had not only read his Shakespeare and his Jonson, and his Beaumont and Fletcher, but had tried his hand at the union of the light and the serious in plays of his own. Theorize as we will, we are so constituted that we give more attention to the views of the worker who has carried his principles into practice than to those of the lofty

critic who dwells in a cloud apart and who contents himself with oracular utterances which he is probably unable specifically to apply. What makes Dryden's criticism so valuable is that it is criticism from the craftsman's point of view; directly or indirectly, most of it is self-criticism.

As adequate as a summary can be is Dr. Johnson's dictum concerning Dryden's essays: "The criticism of a poet; not a dull collection of theorems, nor a crude detection of faults, which perhaps the censor was not able to have committed; but a gay and vigorous dissertation, where delight is mingled with instruction." And even more definitely Professor Saintsbury writes: "The great value of that criticism consists in its extremely appreciative character, and in its constant connexion with the poet's own constructive work. There is much in it which might seem to expose Dryden to the charge of inconsistency. But the truth is, that his literary opinions were in a perpetual state of progress, and therefore of apparent flux. Sometimes he wrote with defective knowledge, sometimes, though not often, without thinking the subject out, sometimes (and this very often) with a certain one-sidedness of view having reference rather to the bearing of the point on experiments he was then trying or about to try, than to any more abstract considerations."

The charge of inconsistency mentioned by Professor Saintsbury has been frequently leveled against Dryden. It assumes two forms: In the first place, it is contended that he often contradicts himself; that what he censures in one essay he commends in another; that his critical standards shift and veer. And, secondly, Dryden is added to the lengthy list of the victims of the deadly *argumentum ad hominem*. We are told that he sets forth certain principles in his essays and then grossly and unblushingly violates them in his plays; that, in short, he fails to practice his own preachments.

In answer to the first charge of inconsistency, Professor Saintsbury hints at an eminently sensible explanation. The essays were written at intervals during a period comprising nearly forty years. Is it to be expected that a man engaged in

active and varied literary work should never change his mind in the course of a life-time? Surely we do not suppose that Dryden as a man in his thirties should possess the fulness of knowledge and the perfection of technical skill that characterized the Dryden enthroned at Will's coffee-house. A rapid reading of the essays in the order in which they were written will show that Professor Saintsbury is right in saying that "his literary opinions were in a perpetual state of progress"; and since we have neither an infallible literary Church nor a literary Pope speaking *ex cathedra,* there is every reason why a man's literary opinions should be characterized by a state of flux, real or apparent.

In some cases, it is true, Dryden did not carry out in practice the theories of poetry and the drama enunciated in his essays; in other words, to borrow a significant phrase from Browning, his reach exceeded his grasp. But is not this the case with every writer who has any theories of his art? Is it not a fact of human experience that good indeed are the divines that follow their own instructions to the letter? And if Dryden failed in some instances to carry out his own ideas of what literary craftsmanship should be, there is abundance of proof that in other instances he realized in his poems and dramas the ideals he had set for himself in his essays. Besides, it is hardly fair to examine a play of one period in the light of principles held by its author at another period. Yet this is what is frequently done by writers who seek to find Dryden guilty of inconsistency. They will, for instance, take the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy," written in 1668, wherein there is a strong defence of the use of rime in tragedies, and contrast Dryden's theory as therein set forth with his practice in the drama, "All for Love," written in blank verse some ten years later. Verily, if consistency be sauce for the playwriting goose, it should be sauce likewise for the critical ganders!

The charge of inconsistency in both its phases ceases to bear much weight when we examine the stages in Dryden's development as a literary dictator. Dryden changed his opinions many times, but they were never meaningless changes. During the

forty years of his active life as a writer, his critical ideas were evolving into a system—a system that he had to formulate for himself through many backslidings and followings after false gods and explorations of blind alleys. His earlier essays are unmethodical and tentative; he feels in a vague and general way that some principles of dramatic construction exist, but he seems unable to formulate them, and besides manifests a youthful impatience of formulas. Next, in such essays as the preface to "An Evening's Love" and "The Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age," he places undue emphasis on the mechanical aspects of poetry, makes a strong plea in favor of rime, and indulges in a rather patronizing attitude toward the Elizabethan dramatists, who were more intent on the matter of which they wrote than the manner in which they wrote it. The preface to "The State of Innocence," "'Antony and Cleopatra' and the Art of Tragedy" and the preface to "Troilus and Cressida" reveal a tacit repudiation of the more extreme theories of his earlier period, less attention to the externals of literature and the formulation of several original principles of dramatic construction. From now on his development is straightforward, and whatever changes appear are changes incidental to progress in the direction of a definite goal. Thus, in his essays, "Virgil and the Æneid" and "On Translating the Poets," and, in general, in the essays written during the last ten years of his life, he gives voice to his finest and ripest theories of criticism and to what Bohn has happily styled "a deep and humanized classicism." In them are found his sanest criticisms of books and life presented in his richest prose style.

In his Leipzig dissertation on "Dryden's Dramatic Theory and Praxis," Mr. G. S. Collins states that the conclusions expressed in the essays "have been almost without influence on the contemporary or later dramatic productions." In its narrower meaning this is true, as it is true of all dramatic criticism, for dramatic criticism considered in its relation to the minutiæ of dramatic construction is descriptive rather than directive. In our own day, the most successful dramatic critics are Chanticlers who happen upon the right moment for crowing

and fancy they are responsible for the sunrise. But in the larger sense, in the sense of criticism of books and plays in their relation to life and of the nature and functions of criticism, Dryden's essays do not permit of such summary dismissal as Mr. Collins would accord them. A survey of some of the characteristics of Dryden's criticism will show that the Restoration dictator formulated principles which have ever since influenced both the theory and the practice of the dramatist's art.

Dryden was the first English critic to introduce the inductive method into dramatic criticism. In this respect he was not only ahead of his age, but ahead of the age of Dr. Johnson. With a deep and abiding respect for the canons of the ancients, and with a realization of the advantages of the "unities" so beloved of the French critics, Dryden did not hesitate to affirm the possibility of development in the drama nor to recognize the merit of plays written in violation of long established rules. He was by no means an impressionist, and would, we may be assured, have slight patience with those present-day critics who act on the principle of the young lady in the art gallery who said: "I don't know anything about art, but I know what I like"; but, on the other hand, he did not arm himself with the rule-of-thumb criteria employed by Ben Jonson in the period that preceded him and by Dr. Johnson in the period that followed. His learning, his craftsmanship and his sterling good sense taught him that the last word anent the principles of poetry and the drama had been uttered by neither Aristotle nor Horace nor Boileau.

All this is merely another way of saying that Dryden was no respecter of persons, even classical persons. His fearlessness and independence have an almost bumptious quality and would be really offensive were they not supported by sound reasoning and an imposing array of pertinent facts. Thus, in condemning the pseudo-classical bombast of the speech of the First Player in "Hamlet"—a speech which, by the way, he is careful to assure us that Shakespeare did not write—Dryden demolishes "the mobled queen" in his best satirical vein:

"What a pudder is here kept in raising the expression of

trifling thoughts! Would not a man have thought that the poet had been bound prentice to a wheelwright for his first rant? and had followed a ragman for the clout and blanket in the second? Fortune is painted on a wheel, and therefore the writer, in a rage, will have poetical justice done upon every member of that engine; after this execution, he bowls the nave down-hill, from Heaven, to the fiends (an unreasonable long mark, a man would think); 'tis well there are no solid orbs to stop it in the way, or no element of fire to consume it; but when it came to the earth it must be monstrous heavy to break ground as low as the centre. His making milch the burning eyes of heaven was a pretty tolerable flight, too, and I think no man ever drew milk out of eyes before him; yet, to make the wonder greater, these eyes were burning." (Preface to "Troilus and Cressida.")

This is not the utterance of a self-sufficient cad who uses poetry as a stalking-horse for his wit, but an expression of the contempt for tawdry and tinsel felt by a man who knew and enjoyed real poetry. Dryden's common sense rebelled at Hecuba, and that same common sense, supported by ripe scholarship, manifested itself frequently in the essays. Thus, he reminds those who object to translations that "a thing well said will be wit in all languages." ("Essay of Dramatic Poesy.") Foreseeing that his avoidance of technical terms in his translation of the Æneid might be censured, he assures his readers that "Virgil has avoided those proprieties, because he writ not to mariners, soldiers, astronomers, gardeners, peasants, etc., but to all in general, and in particular to men and ladies of the first quality, who have been better bred than to be too nicely knowing in the terms." ("Virgil and the Æneid.") Presuming that he was "liable to be charged by false critics" that he Latinized too much, he says: "'Tis true that when I find an English word significant and sounding, I neither borrow from the Latin nor any other language; but, when I want at home, I must seek abroad." (*Ibid.*) In justification for his having modernized Chaucer, he urges: "If the first end of a writer be to be understood, then, as his language grows obsolete,

his thoughts must grow obscure. When an ancient word, for its sound and significancy, deserves to be revived, I have that reasonable veneration for antiquity to restore it. All beyond that is superstition. Words are not like landmarks, so sacred as never to be removed." ("On Translating the Poets.") It was a literary canon formulated by Dryden in his ripest years that common sense "is a rule in everything but matters of Faith and Revelation."

Scott finds the distinguishing trait of Dryden's genius "to have been the power of reasoning, and of expressing the results in appropriate language." Walter Savage Landor has called him "the Bacon of the rhyming tribe." "A considerable touch of the scholastic" is the way Professor Saintsbury describes Dryden's exceptional facility for arguing a point in matters which one school of criticism maintains are beyond the pale of argument. It is this "touch of the scholastic," united to his practical knowledge of literary technique, that makes Dryden at once so sure-footed and fearless as to be styled by the German critic, Paul Hamelius, "the great compromiser." He was neither a rigid classicist like Ben Jonson nor a rabid iconoclast like our own Bernard Shaw; he refused to align himself with any school of criticism, even the school of eclecticism. His mature judgments in literary matters are in the main sound and illuminating, because he reached them, partly by deductive reasoning and reverence for recognized authority, partly by profiting by his experience as a craftsman and by trusting to his intuitive appreciation of the best.

Another thing that Dryden contributed to English criticism was a strong personal note. His essays are the most autobiographical of his writings. His prefaces and dedications are rather too freely besprinkled with that fawning flattery of the great, which was less a distinctive trait in Dryden than a convention of the times in which he lived; but even flattery we can tolerate when it is so delightfully administered as in the postscript to his translation of the Æneid where he returns thanks to the patrons who "have encouraged Virgil to speak such English as I could teach him." Never do we get the impres-

sion that Dryden hands down oracular decisions from the aloofness of an impersonal Olympus. The warmth, the vigor, the attractiveness of his prose style are due in great measure to the very considerable human element that invests the essays. Dryden is never chary of the first personal pronoun, an example which was not lost on the authors of "The Spectator."

But the strongest proof of the intrinsic worth of Dryden's essays and of the influence which they have exerted on subsequent English prose is the distinct impression of modernity which they convey. Nowadays we dispute less over such matters as rime and "heroic" plays, and certain things which Dryden strained himself to demonstrate we happily take for granted; but in its essentials the body of his critical writings is surprisingly applicable to present-day conditions. "Dryden," says Professor Saintsbury, "is in every sense a modern. His list of obsolete words is insignificant, of archaic phrases more insignificant still, of obsolete constructions almost a blank. If any journalist or reviewer were to write his tomorrow's leader or his next week's article in a style absolutely modeled on Dryden, no one would notice anything strange in it, except perhaps that the English was a good deal better than usual."

If it is true that "there are passages of Dryden's satires in which every couplet has not only the force but the actual sound of a slap in the face," there are corresponding passages in the essays in which every phrase has the vigor and directness of a fist blow. Dryden was a man who did not easily take umbrage—despite a general opinion to the contrary—and he could bear with much before breaking out into active self-defense; but when he did respond to the attacks of hostile critics there was no uncertainty in his method of carrying the war, so to say, into the enemy's country. He seems to have taken to heart the advice of Polonius regarding entering into quarrels. His comments on Luke Milbourne, the "M——" of "On Translating the Poets," are, in brief compass, as effective in prose as is his famous castigation of Shadwell in verse. Now, while satire, especially this direct, slapstick satire, may not be the highest form of prose, it is certainly the most search-

ing of the writer's ability to manipulate words. A strong writer does not always triumph in pasquinades; but a weak writer cannot.

In the more mechanical aspects of prose writing, Dryden is immeasurably in advance of his times. He is the father of the paragraph in English. With him the paragraph was a unit of composition, not a mere break in the printed page; and he first brought into use what our modern textbooks of rhetoric call the topic sentence. The prolix and dawdling sentence structure which for centuries had been the heritage of English prose from its Saxon origin, Dryden shortened and recast, and he set an example of definiteness and exactness of expression.

The value of Dryden's essays as models of virile prose is in part due to their author's insistence on the study of English as English. If even today we find men, otherwise perfectly sane and consistent, who claim that the best way to learn to write living English is to write lifeless Latin, in Dryden's time the opinion that an English style had to be developed by systematic practice in English and the imitation of English models had few if any advocates. Here, too, Dryden was in his age, but not of it; his training in the classics and his acquaintance with continental literatures had not blinded him to the importance of cultivating a style in accordance with the genius of the English language. "There are many," he says, in the preface to "Sylvæ," "who understand Greek and Latin, and yet are ignorant of their mother-tongue. The proprieties and delicacies of the English are known to few; 'tis impossible even for a good wit to understand and practice them, without the help of a liberal education, long reading, and digesting of those few good authors we have amongst us, the knowledge of men and manners, the freedom of habitudes and conversation with the best company of both sexes, and, in short, without wearing off the rust which he contracted while he was laying in a stock of learning."

We may safely assert with Scott that "the prose of Dryden may rank with the best in the English language." Both its matter and its manner merit respectful attention. He wrote

not as one beating the air. His theories of literature have today a living interest and constitute a mass of critical material not to be found elsewhere. His style is vigorous, limpid and varied and admirably suited to every theme and every occasion; a style that is what every style ought to be—a flawless transparency through which the reader glimpses the workings of the author's mind.

Dryden's greatness as a master of prose was recognized even in the slight and narrow epoch wherein circumstances had flung him. No other Restoration writer had such devoted adherents or such unrelenting adversaries. And, in the following century, if Pope professed to have learned how to write poetry from him, the prose artists might well have paid a corresponding tribute. Repeatedly Dryden is quoted and referred to in "The Spectator," and always with deference; and so closely did the Queen Anne writers seek to follow his literary theories that he has in a way become more identified with that period than with the epoch in which he actually lived.

Since the days of Mistress Nell Gwynn and Congreve the English drama has changed; since the days of Jeremy Collier English prose has developed. Yet the influence of Dryden is far from spent. His dramatic criticism squares in its essentials with stage conditions on both sides of the Atlantic today, for it concerns itself with dramatic problems that are universal in scope. His essays as examples of English prose are as worthy of study and as effective as models as they were at the time when Dr. Johnson advised aspiring writers to devote their days and their nights to the study of Addison. Addison, in fact, is more remote from our own vigorous age than his great predecessor in the development of English prose.

BROTHER LEO, F. S. C.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

EUGENICS: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

Ever since Sir Francis Galton endeavored to show that the transmission of human qualities could be controlled by a process of selection, the movement aiming at what purports to be race-regeneration has grown steadily.[1] Only in the possession of some constituent elements of truth could such growth be attainable. We are prepared then to find in the so-called science of eugenics much that is in full accord with the Church's teachings. But with this content of truth there will be discovered no small admixture of error to which the Church must stand opposed.

The basic idea of eugenics is not a new one. The notion of a perfect society brought about by artificial control of parentage is one of the very original fabrics of dreamland.

In his Republic Plato would establish a complete community of wives and children. The offspring of infirm parents were not to be allowed to survive while the progeny of the more fit and capable were to be given over to the care and custody of the State. It was ordained, too, that no mother should know her child as no child should know its mother. Thus was it hoped that the love and solicitude ordinarily spent upon offspring would be enlisted in what was conceived to be the higher service of the State. Somewhat modified the same plan appears in Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* as it does later in the ideal commonwealths painted by Moore, Bacon and Campanella.

As according to Engels it was Karl Marx who gave a scientific character to socialism, so we are told it was Sir Francis Galton who endowed what had been thought to be as "air-drawn" as the dagger in Macbeth with the form and method of a veritable science. Thus accepted it is defined by the Euge-

[1] The works in which Galton sought to establish this idea are *Hereditary Genius*, 1869; *English Men of Science*, 1874; *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, 1883; *Life History Album*, 1884; *Record of Family Faculties*, 1884; *Natural Inheritance*, 1889.

nics Education Society to be the "study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally."

This definition is seen to be very comprehensive, so comprehensive indeed that it is made to cover social programs which, we are assured, have not been acceptable to some of the leaders of the movement. Particularly distasteful to these leaders, for example, is the scheme proposed by Mr. Bernard Shaw. This literary jester declares that the present institution of marriage is a hopeless obstacle to the general advancement of the race. Only when a navvy can without slight or hindrance from society marry a countess or a duke a charwoman, can we hope for the beginning of that evolution which is to usher in the day of betterment for our kind. If good breeding is to be sought, and eugenics seeks nothing else, the parents of our improved stock must, we are informed, give up the idea of looking for the companionship which all along has been looked upon as the normal condition of marriage. "Thus the son of a robust, cheerful, eupeptic British squire, with the taste and range of his class, and of a clever, imaginative, intellectual, highly civilized Jewess, might be superior to both his parents: but it is not likely that the Jewess would find the squire an interesting companion or his habits, his friends, his place and mode of life congenial to her. What we must fight for is freedom to breed the race without being hampered by the mass of irrelevant conditions implied in the institution of marriage. If our morality is attacked we carry the war into the enemy's country by reminding the public that the real objection to breeding by marriage is that marriage places no restraint on debauchery, so long as it is monogamic. Wherefore what we need is freedom for people who have never seen each other before and never intend to see one another again, to produce children under certain definite public conditions, without loss of honor."[2] It must be admitted that Mr. Shaw is here commendably clear.

[2] G. Bernard Shaw, *Sociological Papers*, 1904, p. 74-75.

But of course Dr. Saleeby and other followers of Galton are enabled, without much pain, to show that the Shavian program is not eugenic but dysgenic. That it spells not the betterment of the race but its ruin: that instead of raising to higher levels, it is a return to abyssmal depths. Even those who tell us that the original relation of the sexes was one of promiscuity will declare that according as man has moved beyond the range of beasts he has advanced to a more permanent marital union. To this he was impelled through the necessities of his offspring and hence Westermarck says that "Marriage is rooted in family rather than family in marriage."[3] We all know that among several species of brutes the male and female remain some time together in order to protect and nourish their young. To these creatures, therefore, apologies are owing before the eugenic doctrine of Mr. Bernard Shaw is fittingly characterized as bestial.

The protest Christian sentiment instinctively makes against such doctrines is raised against them by accredited eugenists. And justice demands that these should be the primary sources of our information regarding the nature, purpose and methods of this social scheme. Nevertheless to register the opposition made by representative spokesmen to different programs put forward in the name of the science of good breeding is clearly quite different from allowing that such opposition is fully substantiated by the cardinal principles which these authorities would inculcate.

In his *Parenthood and Race Culture,* Dr. Saleeby, a leading disciple of Galton, has some eloquent pages on the relation of the family to eugenics. He gives to the psychical its due pre-eminence over the physical in human parenthood. The doctrine that would dissociate motherhood from the love and protection of fatherhood is sternly repudiated.[4] Another eugenist

[3] Westermarck, Edward, *The History of Human Marriage,* London, 1891, p. 22.

[4] Caleb William Saleeby, *Parenthood and Race Culture,* Moffat Yard and Co., New York, 1909. See especially the chapters, *The Supremacy of Motherhood* and *Marriage and Materialism.*

Professor F. C. S. Schiller, of Oxford, tells us that the biological unit of human life is neither the individual nor the State, but the family.[5]

This is a salient truth and calls for emphasis. The menace to its realization from the State is not, however, from the extensive enlargement of the latter's functions, such as Plato saw in his dream. The idea of a State as a foundling asylum can be entertained only by doctrinaries reckless of the fact and postulates of human nature. It involves too violent an interference with an elementary force in life—the love of parent for offspring. True it is this love in the human parent is only too often an instinctive impulse uninformed by any rational process marking it off in kind from the love of the lower animal for its young. It, therefore, will often need direction and guidance. Its shortcomings will often require to be supplied. But it can never be supplanted.

The danger to the due position of the family threatened by the State is of a less extreme and definite form. Nevertheless a real danger it is. It is to be found in the comprehensive and detailed legislation regarding the nurture and upbringing of the child without sufficient address to parenthood. Such legislation would be taken up with the care and cultivation of the flower forgetful the while of the tree. The result is that the sense of parental responsibility has become generally weakened. This means that the due relation of the family to the social organism and indeed to life itself is bound to become less appreciated. In the insistence of the eugenists upon culture for parenthood, the vital fact of such relationship is at least brought to the fore. But it is particularly from this side of individualism that there comes the menace of which we are speaking. This individualism finds its present expression in more than a mere drift or tendency. It finds embodiment in a "new morality," or to use a more fitting characterization, a "new freedom." It is to be the means of a greater self-realization—a self-realization that has too long been cabined, cribbed, con-

[5] F. C. S. Schiller, *Eugenics and Politics*, Art. in Hibbert Journal, January, 1914.

fined by the forms and conventions built up by the old morality now become effete. It is to be observed that the word morality, is to be here accepted in its restricted sense as applied to the relations of sex. In other words it is in just the sphere where the greatest insurgency against the control and dominancy of reason is experienced that the restraining bars are to be let down. Such bars are those particularly that are found in monogamy. That this form of marriage represents a high advance over polygamy and polyandry the preachers of the new morality will not deny. Speaking of the good brought about by monogamy, the Swedish writer, Ellen Key, a leader in the new movement, says: [6]

"It minimised the struggle of the men for the women, and this economised forces for other ends, it provided an incentive to work for offspring, it developed modesty and tenderness within the sexual relationship and thus raised the position of the woman and with it her importance in the bring-up of the children, it provided them and her with a protection against the arbitrary will of the husband; through home life it fostered self-command and coöperation; the need of the two for each other led to mutual kindness. But . . . monogamy which was a custom long before the introduction of Christianity, became injurious as well as beneficial to true sexual morality, from the moment the Church prescribed it as the only form of this morality."

Another form, therefore, more conducive to race betterment is now called for. This is to be found, not only in a greater freedom to contract marital union without external form or sanction, but to break the marriage bond directly "a real union is no longer possible." And this real union becomes impossible when mutual love ceases. As soon, therefore, as either husband or wife fail to feel for each the sentiments which prompted their intermarriage, they should be severally free to break their bonds and enter into a new alliance. Nor is it necessary to wait until mutual love has passed, for "even when love is real and well-founded there yet arise, from the charm of contradictions, . . . innumerable occasions of miserable discord." [7] Here surely is an open door.

[6] Ellen Key, *Love and Marriage*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, p. 9 10.

[7] Ellen Key, op. cit. p. 317.

All this, it is admitted, is in clear contravention of the ordinary vows of lovers, and of the troth plighted in the marriage ceremony. But these pledges of fidelity must not be looked upon as binding in the sobering light that succeeds love's young dream. When lovers come to a finer sense of social responsibility, they will not give, much less exact, promises which they know they will be constrained to disregard if an inner necessity should develop in the future.[8] It is moreover a "satanic device" to seek to establish a legal institution of lasting endurance upon vows at breaking of which Jove does well to laugh.[9]

Ellen Key, we infer, would advise that one should be off with the old love, before he might be on with the new, but even this restriction would be withdrawn by some of our new moralists. Says Mr. Walter M. Gallechan in the *English Review* for Sept., 1913:

"Under present economic conditions and the prejudice of social opinion, the penalties which women have to pay for any sexual relationship outside of marriage is too heavy. . . . I believe if there were some open recognition of these partnerships outside of marriage, not necessarily permanent, with proper provision for the woman and her children, should there be any, a provision not dependent on the generosity of the man, and made after the love which sanctioned the union had waned, but in the form of a contract before the relationship was entered upon, there would be many women ready to undertake such unions gladly. . . . It is also possible that such contracts might be made by those who were unsuitably mated and yet did not wish entirely to sever the bond between them, with some other partner they could love. Such contracts would open up possibilities of happy partnership to many."

After listening to this kind of ethics one experiences a sense of healthy reaction in hearing the sane representatives of

[8] Ellen Key, op. cit. p. 291.

[9] Ideally speaking, it is plain that anything like a perfect union must have perfect freedom for its condition; and while it is quite supposable that a lover might, out of the fulness of his heart, make promises and give pledges, it is really almost inconceivable that anyone having that delicate and proud sense which marks deep feeling, could possibly demand a promise from his loved one. As there is undoubtedly a certain natural reticence in sex, so perhaps the most decent thing in true marriage would be to say nothing—make no promises—either for a year or a lifetime. Edward Carpenter, *Love's Coming of Age*, Chicago, Alice B. Stockham and Co., p. 107.

eugenics insist upon monogamy as being the form of sex relationships possessed of survival value. This quality it has because of the protection and nurture it secures to the child. For only in the bosom of the family with its intimate life and sympathies, its continuous call for unselfishness and sacrifice, its apportionment of responsibility can the physical, affectional and moral natures of the child find the sufficient theatre for due development. Herein only is to be found the training ground for the individual direction and control upon which true growth must ever be conditioned. Palpably inconsistent therefore are the advocates of the present autonomous ethics in seeking to obtain for the parent freedom for ampler self-realization by consigning the child to conditions wherein a full and ordered unfolding of its peculiar powers is hopelessly impossible. True it is the absence of peace and love between parents offers an unpromising sanctuary and school for the upbringing of offspring, yet even in such environment as Foerster points out, the child may gain a body of experience of greater value for life than were possible from any State custodianship.[10]

In stating that the eugenists contend for monogamy as the only form of sex relationship of social value, we would not be understood as allowing that the principles finding general advocacy among them comport with such insistence. Indeed we must note the fatal contradiction involved in inveighing against the principles which would repudiate monogamy and at the same time upholding an institution directly subversive of this form of marriage. We refer to the institution of divorce. And here we would prescind from the teachings of positive religion regarding the permanency of the marriage-tie. We would appeal only to the postulates of Nature and her purposes upon which we can take a common footing with the eugenists. And on this ground we meet with the imperious prescription that monogamic marriage is the ordained organ for the future, that its primary end is not the betterment, the de-

[10] F. W. Foerster, *Marriage and the Sex Problem*, Frederick H. Stokes, New York. p. 48.

velopment of the individual, but the conservation of the race. Unhesitatingly therefore Nature lays her ax upon the root of the idea that erotic love is the prime and necessary condition of marriage. Unreservably she repudiates such an attitude as this from *The Freewoman:* "I certainly hope Freewomen will not enter upon the sex relationship for any such conscious purpose as that of reproduction, but rather that they will find in the passionate love between man and woman, even if it be transient, the only sanction for sex intimacy."[11] No, marriage can come by its assigned purpose, only by means of a state of comradeship,—a comradeship which the weal of the child and of the race demands shall be enduring. Only in this companionship can marriage be raised above the levels where "hog-philosophy"—to use Carlyle's phrase—would keep it. According to the testimony given in the majority report of the Divorce Commission of England, submitted last year, "No witness has been able to tell us of a country, where as the result of greater facility for the dissolution of marriage, public morality has been promoted, the ties of the family—of husband and wife, of parents and children, have been strengthened and home life has been made purer and more settled." But the strengthening of ties between husband and wife, and parents and children, the bringing to the home a higher purity and to its life a greater stability, is not the ultimate purpose of this bond but the means and condition by which this purpose becomes attainable. For in such family life is the child best furnished with the props and stays which Nature intended for the being upon which depends the future of the race.

That the ties of marriage are felt by an increasing number to be galling fetters cannot be denied. The Feminists will not let us forget that. Indeed we are told that as long as the present ethics prevail, marriage will entail for woman nothing short of serfdom. Now if it were against artificial conditions following upon economic or social ills of a contingent nature, the protests raised by our feminine individualists would inevi-

[11] *The Freewoman*, vol. I, p. 153 *et seq.*

tably prevail. It would then be the cry of outraged justice But it is against nothing short of monogamy as an institution that the voice of insurgency is raised. "The ultimate aim of Feminism," says W. L. George in last December's *Atlantic Review,* "is the practical suppression of marriage and the institution of free alliance." But the inexorable purpose of Nature discovers this outcry's impotency. True it certainly is that for many individual cases the lasting ties of marriage must act as a cruel and embittering thralldom. Even in the best regulated families constant intimacy becomes oftimes boresome, not infrequently oppressive. But this only bears witness to the fact that Nature is so concerned with the perpetuation of the type that she would often ignore the individual, that only in the travail, often in the very death of the latter does she attain her end.

Here it has not been our purpose to demonstrate the Catholic doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage. It has been sufficient to show that the teaching of the eugenists regarding easier divorce is directly detrimental to the interests for which they have arrayed themselves as champions; that such teaching is ultimately dysgenic, that it negatives the cardinal principle conditioning all race amelioration which is that the family and not the individual is the unit of society.

In the cause of race betterment the eugenists have necessarily insisted much upon the dignity and office of motherhood. And clearly with the mother and with motherhood the dearest plans of Nature are all bound up. That growing numbers of women today shirk maternal responsibility naturally gives the eugenist serious concern. The failure to discharge this role has given rise to consequences which have been pointed out by Mr. and Mrs. Whetham in their striking book *The Family and the Nation.* According to these authors there is a gradual lessening of the social values upon which the continued welfare of the race necessarily depends. To put it otherwise the quality of the race through the pressure of circumstances generally prevailing is deteriorating, for reliable records reveal the fact that within a generation the birth-rate of the desirable members of the population of England—the upper classes, the middle

classes and the skilled artisan classes have fallen from four and a half to two. What has occurred in England we are warranted in concluding has taken place in our own country. Indeed, there is ample reason to think that the birth-rate among the corresponding portion of our people has, in the same time, shown a more marked diminution. Now it has been proved that if any class of the population is to keep up its numbers in a succeeding generation there must be four children to every one of its fertile marriages. This means that, in one generation, the more valuable members of our population, as of those in England, have become in numerical strength only one-half of what is required in order that they may be saved from extinction. When, on the other hand, we realize that the average number of offspring among the feeble-minded and weaker stocks is in England, and most probably in America, more than seven we can appreciate the concern to which we have above referred.[12]

Moreover, the proper care demanded by the growing number of our mentally defective population constitutes for the community an increasing burden which threatens to become unbearable. We are informed that one-seventh of the revenue of the State of New York is expended in looking after its defectives. According to Dr. Goddard, the United States is taking care of only one-tenth of its mentally defectives. Already, the opinion among our people is general; that there is overtaxation for this purpose. "It is impossible," concludes the author just quoted, "to entertain the thought of caring for ten times as many."[13] Here then is a condition that surely augurs ill. It would seem to spell the inevitable inundation of the sane and able by the engulfing waves of the unfit and defective members of our society. It would unmistakably inculcate upon these sane and able members the obligation of eliciting a different story from the birth-rate statistics.

But how is this to be done? Is it to be brought about by holding up the ideal of motherhood, much as Dr. Saleeby would

[11] Whetham, William C. and Catherine D., *The Family and the Nation*, p. 122 *et seq.*

[12] Henry Herbert Goddard, Ph. D., *The Kallikak Family*, p. 105.

body this forth? No doubt the picture is a charming one, even though it ceases to appeal to many of our feminists. But the trouble is that the resultant admiration of it ever remains quite distinct from the imitation it would be made to preach. The drunkard and the libertine have gone their way, not because the ideal of temperance or of purity has ceased longer to be able to win their esteem, as neither have taken their course because they were lured by the hideous mien of vice, but because there intervened between the most genuine homage to an ideal and the effort to exemplify it, the obstacles placed by indulgence, selfishness, sensuality. To these latter address must be directed if the exemplar raised aloft would become operative.

Professor Schiller sees hope in the day when the "ancestor worship of the animist can be developed into the descendant worship of the eugenist."[14] But a very discouraging obstacle in the way of such development is to be found in a very radical difference between ancestor worship and descendant worship. In the conviction of the animist, ancestors still live. They can exact a present accountability. But descendants are too unreal a quantity to succeed in imposing upon the ordinary citizen the same definite kind of obligation even though he might not be impelled to the Irishman's query: "What has posterity done for us?"

It is not to be denied that reason would prescribe clear social duties in these circumstances. This it does by disclosing the exactions of the law of Nature. That law we have already referred to. Yet urgent though these reasons be and clear the way they would point, they are quite insufficient. They may seem so when canvassed in the laboratory or library, but when brought to bear upon ordinary flesh and blood, it will be discovered that they fall short. This for the reason that the flesh and blood of humanity can be raised above itself only by a power not itself. It can be raised only by the force and pressure of motives and sanctions with which our eugenist does not reckon or reckons insufficiently. It is these same motives

[14] F. C. Schiller, "Eugenics and Politics," article in *Hibbart Journal*, January, 1914.

and sanctions which can still make the unselfishness, sacrifice and altruism demanded by race welfare again assert themselves above our fatal individualism. "The aim of eugenists," says Mr. Galton, "is to bring as many influences as can be reasonably employed to cause the useful classes in the community to contribute more than their proportion to the next generation." If the influences thus far brought by the eugenist to this end comprehend the sum total of those from which they take their hope, we do not hesitate to affirm the prospect is not an encouraging one.

Of course we would not represent Mr. Galton and his accredited followers as ignoring or disparaging all religion. What we would maintain is that the religion they would recognize and avow is not the power whence can come the social regeneration they seek. Such religion they declare to be the "whole-hearted acceptance of eugenics . . . the thorough conviction by a nation that no worthier object exists for man than the improvement of his own race." [15] "I claim," says Dr. Saleeby, "that eugenics is religious, is and will ever be a religion." [16] The Very Rev. W. R. Inge preaches to the same effect. Religion is to find its end and aim in the eugenic good. In this alone we discover the eternal values.[17] This idea Dr. Saleeby would illustrate when he tells us, "If the mother and child worship which is to be found in the more modern religions, such as Christianity, is to be worth anything to the coming world, it must cease to have reference to one mother and one child only: it must hail every mother everywhere as a Madonna and every child as in some measure deity incarnate." [18] Without adverting

[15] Francis Galton, *Sociological Papers*, MacMillan, 1905, p. et seq.

[16] C. W. Saleeby: op. cit. p. 351.

[17] The worthy Dean deplores the fact that: "We do not think it wicked to encourage a beautiful and glorious specimen of womanhood to become a nun or Sister of Mercy, with vows of perpetual virginity. Here surely is a case in which the Eugenics Educational Society ought to have something to say. A man or woman belonging to a good stock ought to be told by public opinion that it is a duty to society for him or her to marry and have children."

[18] C. W. Saleeby, *Woman and Womanhood*, Mitchell Kennerley, New York, 1911, p. 148.

to the irreverence in the foregoing, we repeat again that the so-called religion which it describes is thoroughly impotent to bring the race up to higher levels than those upon which it now ranges. The evidence of history is sufficient regarding the uplifting worth of man-made deities. It is only by laying hold of what is above us that we can elevate ourselves. We can never do so by pulling on our boot straps.

It would be interesting to know if the author quoted above in speaking of "every mother everywhere" would include the illegitimate mother. We would not be warranted in inferring his intention to be such, since he always refers to motherhood as buttressed by a responsible and supporting fatherhood. Nevertheless we are constrained to move the question because of the protest now being raised in the name of the new ethics against the drawing of any distinction between legitimate and illegitimate motherhood. This protest is logical, for if erotic love may be indulged outside of marriage no stigma must be attached to its inevitable fruits. In this new morality the light as in Correggio's Holy Night will, Ellen Key tells us, radiate from the child. But sweet and engaging though this light be, it cannot be sufficient to dispell the darkness of antecedent sin. Our sympathy shall go out indeed to the helpless child, as our pity shall not fail the mother, particularly if, as the saying goes, she has been more sinned against than sinning. Yet evil she has done and that of a social kind. For despite the halo of romance thrown around it and the warmth of sentimentalism with which it is made to glow, the new sexual morality spells inevitably a lasting detriment to the due nurture of offspring. This, too, not because of a public opinion and attitude purely artificial and accidental in character, but because of violence done to nature's organ for the proper conservation of the race—monogamic marriage.

From what has been said it is not to be concluded that all individualism is dysgenic. But the individualism compatible with social weal has naught in it subversive of monogamy. If it seeks exemption from the solicitude described by the Apostle as the lot of the married, it is not to gain a larger opportunity

for indulgence but an ampler liberty for devotion. The dedication to things of the mind or spirit in which this individualism would assert itself is conditioned upon a life of celibacy. For it must be allowed that such dedication is hampered and checked by the cares and responsibilities of married life. Love can make these burdens seem easy; it cannot, however, make them less engrossing. While, therefore, the sensualist or sluggard may see in such binding duties a compelling motive for celibacy, it can well be that freedom from their assumption can be desired for reasons altogether worthy.

Here now it is not our purpose to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of the pre-eminence of the virginal over the marital state. Rather would we indicate the eugenic value of the institution for which Mr. Galton, even more than Dean Inge, has words of condemnation.[19] For the high moral character of the Catholic religious Mr. Galton has unmistakable regard. Indeed, it is because of their individual nobility that he finds ground for his indictment against celibacy as an institution, since it is owing to this latter that these gentle nature have no continuance.

But the eugenist need not be told that there is a heritage other than an organic one—a heritage no less real than that transmitted through the germ-plasm.

Now everyone not widely prejudiced will acknowledge the debt the world is under to the mediæval celibates for the treasures of literature, which otherwise would have been irretrievably lost. Everyone should know, too, that only in peaceful and ordered seclusion from the stress and battlings whence emerged modern Europe could there be found the conditions for the sustained application necessary for this literary fruitage. But

[19] "Whenever a man or woman was possessed of a gentle nature that fitted him or her to deeds of charity, to meditation, to literature or to art, the social condition of the time was such that they had no refuge elsewhere than in the bosom of the Church. But the Church chose to preach and exact celibacy and the consequence was that these gentle natures had no continuance and this by a policy so singularly unwise and suicidal, that I am hardly able to speak of it without impatience. The Church brutalized the breed of our forefathers." Francis Galton, *Heriditary Genius*, MacMillan, 1892. These words, Dr. Saleeby declares, should be printed in letters of gold. C. W. Saleeby, *Parenthood and Race Culture*, p. 132.

more valuable than mental or artistic accomplishment was the example of moral excellence left by the monks and nuns of whom Mr. Galton speaks. They were examples of self-conquest. Their continency gave the lie to the contention that the demands of the sexual appetite are so imperious that they must be satisfied. An illustration of this sovereignty of the spirit was needed not alone for those who were to make religious profession, but for society at large. It was fraught, as it ever will continue to be, with richest beneficence for the marital state. For if marriage is to be pure and its bed undefiled, there must be brought to it a clean mind and a chaste body. If it is not to be simply the means of gratifying erotic love, its bond enduring only as long as this kind of love shall last, it must know a life of continual restraint. It is required first of all for this that the self-mastery called for be regarded as within the due compass of human achievement. In the just appreciation of celibacy this thought finds its most effective inculcation.

But it is not in its eugenic value that celibacy finds its ultimate warrant. To say so is to fall into the basic error of the eugenists of constituting as an end what of its nature is but a means. The individual is for society in the sense that in society he is to gain the perfection and complement of his nature and faculties. But this perfection is not finally for society; it is that the component members may reach the destiny ordained by a Personal Creator. It is just here that there rests the ultimate title to all human rights. As this destiny, moreover, is an individual one, every rational being with reference to it is autocentric. In his advance to the goal he may not be stopped in any way or by any agency; yet between the rights of the individual and those of society there can be no real conflict. For in tending to his end the former must promote the aim and purpose of the latter, which finds its good in just the measure in which it conduces members to this very end. There is, therefore, a genuine individualism, one thoroughly compatible with the exigencies of society. Of such individualism is ecclesiastical celibacy.

JOHN WEBSTER MELODY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Bergson, an Exposition and Criticism, by Thomas J. Gerrard. St. Louis, Herder. Pp. xii + 208. Price 90 cents.

The attempt to give a popular criticism of Professor Bergson's philosophy is justified by the fact that this philosophy is no longer restricted to philosophical literature, but has found its way in a more or less diluted form into ordinary magazines and even newspapers. As a method of criticism metaphors may prove useful in skilful hands, but Bergson is a master in this art, and some of those which we find in the book under review seem weak in comparison. At times also the argument ignores the real point at issue. For instance, no philosopher, Bergsonian or anti-Bergsonian, will be convinced by the following dilemma which is hardly more than a quibble: "Either the flux is or it is not. If it is not it has no reality. But it has reality. Therefore it is." It is what? A changing or a stable reality? This is the question. The reader would also like to know which editions or translations are quoted. Thus neither in the English translation nor in the French edition at my disposal have I been able to find the passages of *Creative Evolution* on the pages referred to by the author. The task of explaining and criticising Professor Bergson for the average reader is a difficult one, in which complete success is not to be expected. Such as it is, this book—a reprint of articles published in the *Catholic World*—will be serviceable as a guide for those who desire both an acquaintance with Bergson's philosophy and an indication of some lines along which a criticism of it may proceed.

C. A. Dubray, S. M.

Francisco Palou's *Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, founder of the Franciscan Missions of California.* English translation by G. Scott Williams. Introduction and Notes by George Wharton James. Pasadena, California, George Wharton James. 1913. Pp. 338.

The first historical work on Upper California, printed in Mexico

during 1787, was for a long time locked up from all Americans except the few who were able to read the Spanish. Even to them the volume was not easily accessible. In offering to the public an English version of this valuable book, Mr. James has therefore performed a service at once noteworthy and patriotic.

The importance of Father Palou's book, dealing as it does with the beginnings of California, is very great. Its worth is enhanced by the fact that it includes a great number of documents, and by the circumstance that its author, though he does not once allude to his own exploits, was a part of the grand achievements of Father Junípero Serra. Around the life of this venerable priest the author has woven the story of the founding of the California missions.

At the outset the author warns his reader not to expect any unusual graces of style, as he would be certain to find in the pages of Bossuet. Father Palou is a plain, blunt man, who loved his friends. Whatever may be said of his literary art his narrative is always interesting and clear. From the birth of Father Serra, November 24, 1713, in the island of Mallorca, the book relates the incidents of his rather feeble boyhood and youth, especially those influences which contributed to make him scholarly and pious. Though he had been christened Miguel Joseph, because of his great veneration for the holy companion of Saint Francis when, in 1731, he made his profession he took the name Junípero. Soon the delicate youth was growing not only in spiritual but in bodily strength. This improvement in health he ascribed to his having made his vows. His career as an instructor extended and confirmed his scholarship. Indeed, if he had not devoted himself to the conversion and the civilizing of savages, it is certain that he would have acquired renown as an orator.

He left his native land to work in the American wilderness. In 1750, after his arrival in Mexico, he renewed his novitiate in the College of San Fernando. During the same year he had his first experience as a missionary in the Sierra Gorda among the Pame Indians. The work among the members of this tribe was highly successful. The natives were instructed not only in the elements of Christian Doctrine but in the art of agriculture. At this time they had every species of cattle; also fruits, cereals, and vegetables. In a little while they were assigned separate holdings of land and given the seeds and the cattle necessary for

their cultivation. The example of the pious Father Junípero influenced the other missions to adopt his rational system. When his heart was gladdened by the abundant fruits of his zeal, he was chosen for work among the warlike Apaches. This he was destined not to undertake.

On June 25, 1767, the Society of Jesus was suppressed in New Spain. Sixteen of its members had labored in Lower California. The missions attended by them were recommended to the College of San Fernando, which has been mentioned above. By its Superior, Father Junípero was named as one of the friars for the California missions. With his companions he embarked in March, 1768. In a fortnight all were safe at Loreto. It was then concluded to found missions at San Diego, Monterey, and one under the name of San Buenaventura.

In the succeeding pages the reader will learn of spiritual heroes, and of the gigantic work undertaken and promoted by the Spanish monarchy. He will be told of the transportation of large quantities of seeds and great herds of cattle to regions more distant from Mexico than Moscow is from Madrid. He will see a strange cavalcade, fearless explorers, armored soldiers, picturesque friars, uncouth Indians, disembarking promptly and soon after winding its way through a changing landscape. This was not the sterile land of Lower California or the waterless waste of Arizona, both of which the Spaniards knew.

In this favored region there were soon founded five missions. Scarcely a detail of their establishment is omitted by the chronicler. We know how many axemen felled and fashioned the timber for each mission-house, how many pagans first approached the strangers, and the number converted before the death of the pious founder. The dusky lambs looked harmless to their new pastors, who had yet to learn that the superstitions of the Indian often drove him to madness. It was some baseless fear of their new friends that led a thousand frenzied red men to attack and destroy the San Diego mission. The survivors were at first appalled, but the murder of a missionary was no novelty to the followers of Saint Francis. Centuries before they had cheerfully encountered perils from Palestine to Pekin. Now they merely rebuilt the ruined station and established new ones, among them Santa Clara and San Francisco.

The zealous Father Junípero was equally tranquil before the ben

ded bow of an Indian and the raised dagger of an English fanatic. In a word, he knew no fear. To his perfect faith, his humility, and his hunger for souls are to be ascribed the miracles wrought in Upper California. This entertaining book will make the reader acquainted with the Venerable Father Junípero Serra as he never knew him by panegyric. In it he will behold a worthy disciple of Saint Francis. A map of both Californias, reproduced from the original work, and annotated by Mr. James, indicates the location of the Franciscan missions and the geography of the entire coastal region.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

Searching the Scriptures, by Rev. T. P. F. Gallagher. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1912. 12mo, 431 pp. $1.75 net.

The book is divided into two parts, corresponding to the twofold task to which the author has applied himself, namely to ascertain what are the prophetic passages in the Old Testament that clearly point to the future Messias, and to show that these prophecies find their fulfillment in our Lord Jesus Christ. In his treatment of the prophecies, he keeps well within the bounds of strict conservative orthodoxy. The rationalistic critics, who try to find a natural explanation for every event in sacred history, are unsparingly taken to task at every turn. While the author may not always convince, there is no mistaking his zeal in the defense of traditional views of Scripture. Sometimes it is to be feared his acquaintance with the critics is not as accurate as might be, as when, for example, he says on page vii that, " Strauss indeed denied the historic existence of Jesus." For some reason the book has not been provided with a table of contents.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

La révélation primitive et las données actuelles de la science, d'après l'ouvrage allemand du R. P. G. Schmidt. A. Lemonnyer, O. P. 12mo, 335 pp. Paris, J. Gabalda, 1914.

One has to read the preface to discover that this work is simply a translation, embellished with a few extra footnotes, of a German

treatise of Father Schmidt. Even then no information is vouchsafed regarding the original, which is a contribution to the German apologetic work in three volumes entitled, *Religion, Christentum und Kirche,* the joint product of several scholars, edited by Professors Esser and Mausbach. Father Schmidt's contribution is found in the first volume under the title, *Die Uroffenbarung als Anfang der Offenbarung Gottes.* The author, William Schmidt, whose name is incorrectly given as G. Schmidt on the title page of the above-mentioned French translation, is a member of the missionary Society of the Divine Word, and enjoys an international reputation as editor of the learned publication, *Anthropos,* and as the author of several books and articles dealing with anthropology and the history of primitive religions.

In the treatise under review, the author has in mind to set forth on the basis of acquired results of modern science the historic likelihood and reality of the story of primitive revelation as told in the opening chapters of Genesis. From a study of the inspired record, he comes to the conclusion that while God revealed Himself to our first parents as their supernatural end, the contents of that revelation were so simple and limited as easily to be grasped by normal, though untrained human minds. They were little more than the fundamental truths that God exists, that He is the maker of all things, the guardian of the moral law, the requiter of good and evil, that man owes Him strict obedience, that husband and wife are equal and should live in loving, inseparable companionship. Now, he finds, the earliest representatives of mankind known to science were capable of receiving such a revelation as this, and the similarity of their religious and moral life with that portrayed in Genesis in respect to first man tells strongly in favor of the reality of primitive revelation.

Who are these earliest types of men known to science? They are first of all those whose scanty remains have been revealed by prehistoric archaeology. These prehistoric men, he observes, have left evidence that they buried their dead with care, looking to a life beyond the grave, and hence having a religion. If their tools were largely of roughly hewn stone, they show the use of intelligence, and that too of a high order. They were fit subjects for such a revelation as is recorded in the beginning of Genesis. A few anthropologists struck by the brutal character of some of the human jaw-bones dating from prehistoric times have concluded

that primitive man did not possess the power of articulate speech. This is a mistake, for so great an authority as Klaatsch calls attention to the fact that many Australians today have the same form of jaw and palate.

But it is in the field of ethnology that the author finds the strongest argument for the reality of primitive revelation. He accepts the principle championed by so many anthropologists that the nearest approaches to primitive man and to primitive life are to be found in certain savage tribes whose culture rests on a low plane by reason of retarded development. He finds the best representatives of early man in the so-called pigmy tribes—the negrillos of Central Africa, the Negritos of the Phillipines, the dark dwarfed natives of Malacca, the Andaman Islands, and of Southeast Australia. According to Kollmann and other anthropologists, all races of man are descendants of primitive pigmy forms, which in turn arose by a process of development from anthropoid apes. The theory of evolution thus lends weight to the view that the existing pigmy races are the nearest representatives known of primitive man. In view of this, it is not surprising that Father Schmidt should betray a certain amount of sympathy for the evolution theory, though he does this in language carefully guarded. He recognizes, to be sure, that it is still an unproved theory, but he is impressed with the fact that it is held in favor by the great majority of biological experts, Catholics included. While he finds that Genesis itself may be interpreted in favor of a divinely ordained evolution of man's body as well as in favor of its direct formation from the slime of the earth, he is forced to recognize a serious obstacle in the decision of the Biblical Commission declaring the historical reality of the formation of the first woman from the first man.

On the supposition that the pigmy tribes are the best known representatives of primitive man, Father Schmidt proceeds to show that, all things considered, their religious and moral life is not very far removed from that portrayed in Genesis of our first parents. Nature-worship, ghost-worship, and magic are but slightly developed among them. A supreme being, whom they feebly worship, is the object of their reverence. He is known by such names as Heaven, Thunderer, Lord, Father, and is generally conceived with anthropomorphic traits, as dwelling in heaven. He is not represented by any artificial forms. He is legislator and guar-

dian of the moral law, rewarding the good and punishing the wicked. The moral standard is much higher than what is found elsewhere among savage peoples. Monogamy is almost universal. Conjugal fidelity is strongly insisted on. There is no slavery, no infanticide, no killing of the aged. The children are taught to be truthful, honest, kind, respectful to the aged and those in distress. If religion in so high a form can exist on an enduring basis among these benighted savages, by what right shall we deny a similar, tho purer, religion to Adam? Is not the religious and moral life of these savages best explained as a preservation, with retarded development, of primitive conditions?

Father Schmidt finds features of their religious, moral and economic life that go to bear out the truth of the picture given in Genesis. In the first place, among all the pigmies, except the Samangs of Malacca, there is a first-fruit-offering to the supreme being as lord and proprietor of all things. This form of sacrifice, he thinks, carries us back to the Garden of Eden, where the command of God not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was tantamount to a first-fruit-sacrifice, for the prohibition was probably intended to be but temporary, to be rewarded after due time with the enjoyment of this forbidden fruit as well as that of the tree of life, which was to give immortality. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel were first-fruit-offerings.

In the second place, the general custom of monogamy among the pigmies, with the exclusion of the matriarchal system, is evidence that the monogamy depicted in Genesis is the truly primitive form.

Thirdly, the picture which Genesis gives of Adam and Eve subsisting on the fruits which nature in her bounty presented is quite in accordance with primitive conditions as found among the pigmies. They live by hunting, fishing, and picking such edible fruits and plants as grow without cultivation. Again, Father Schmidt observes, in primitive conditions, it is the man who looks after the procuring of animal foods, while the woman is busied with the gathering of fruits and useful plants. He thinks it significant that in the Genesis story it is Adam who gave the names to the animals, and holds it not unlikely that Eve had the naming of the plants. At any rate it was she who plucked the forbidden fruit and gave it to her husband.

Such is the gist of the work which Father Schmidt has pro-

duced, with an arrangement of material which does not bespeak the highest sense of logical order. It is not advisable here to dwell on another chapter of the work in which he calls to task the leading skeptical critics of Genesis and tries on the basis of Hilprecht's Nippur discoveries to prove the greater antiquity of the Genesis story of Paradise and the Flood in comparison with the Babylonian versions. He has brought together in this work useful material for showing the likelihood of primitive revelation, but it can hardly be said that his attempted proof of the reality of the Genesis story of primitive revelation on the basis of modern science amounts to a strict demonstration.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Commentaire francais litteral de la Somme Theologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin. O. P. Pègues. T. VIII, Les Vertus et Les Vices (Toulouse, 1913, Edouard Privat, 14 Rue des Arts.)

The eighth volume of Father Pègues excellent translation and commentary deals with the subjects treated in Q. Q. 55-89 of St. Thomas' *Prima-Secundae* (for other volumes see *Catholic University Bulletin*, April, 1913). Those who are familiar with the order of the *Summa* know that these Questions are a continuation of the treatise on Habits (*Habitus*). Habits in general were explained in the preceding tracts (q. q. 49-55): it is now time to consider good Habits, *i. e.*, the *Virtues* (q. q. 55-70) and evil Habits, *i. e.*, the *Vices* and the *Sins* which they cause (q. q. 70-89). To the treatise on Virtues is annexed the study of the Gifts, Beatitudes and Fruits of the Holy Ghost. Since St. Thomas has been styled "the most saintly of learned men," one naturally expects to find a combination of learning and holiness manifested in his writings on these subjects so intimately related to the salvation of souls. The student of these treatises will not be disappointed. Here he will find in abundance, briefly and accurately exposed, salutary doctrine on the virtues which men should practice and the sins which they should avoid. In this part of the *Summa* he treats of them in a general way only: a more complete and detailed exposition is reserved for the *Secunda-Secundae*. He treats of the virtues and sins both as a philosopher and as a

theologian. In his *Ethics* Aristotle explained natural virtues in a manner that was most creditable to a pagan. Using and perfecting his principles St. Thomas explains the intellectual, moral and theological virtues so luminously and so accurately that even one who is not a deep student can see that grace does not destroy but perfects nature. He was a wonderful psychologist as well as a saintly believer in Christian truth, and we know that he practiced what he taught. This gives added weight to his conclusions on subjects of vital importance to all who wish to know what men should do and what they should avoid. His treatise on original sin has long been recognized as a model of penetration combined with accuracy and sobriety of judgment. The articles in which the Angelic Doctor explains the Gifts, Beatitudes and Fruits of the Holy Ghost (q. q. 68, 69, 70) deserve special attention. They are the foundation of all solid books of instruction on those subjects written since the time of St. Thomas. Many points of his teaching were emphasized by Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical on the Holy Spirit (*Divinum Illud,* May 4, 1897), and that these truths are of great importance in our times will be evident to those who read that remarkable document concerning "the indwelling and miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, and the extent and efficiency of His action, both in the whole body of the Church and in the individual souls of its members, through the glorious abundance of his divine graces."

In his commentary Father Pègues prudently refrains from a discussion of the many doubts and controversies which have busied theologians treating of the virtues and sins. He seeks to let St. Thomas speak for himself, giving just enough of commentary to enable his readers to ascertain the true mind of the Angelic Doctor, and this is always more satisfactory than anything that can be found in the works of other authors. There may be room for a difference of opinions among sincere believers, yet always will there be genuine respect for the opinions of one who never lightly gave expression to any opinion.

Father Pègues must be an indefatigable worker. He gives to the public every year at least one volume of his lucid commentary, notwithstanding the many duties connected with his position as Professor of Theology in the international house of studies in Rome, where he expounds the second part of the *Summa* of St. Thomas.

D. J. Kennedy, O. P.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Historical Sketch of the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.

The *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* or Collection of Oriental Christian Writers is the general title of a series of publications issued by the Gabalda firm of Paris under the auspices of The Catholic University of America and The Catholic University of Louvain. This collection, when completed, will number about eight hundred volumes and include practically all the known Christian works now extant in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic and Armenian. It will add many interesting documents to Oriental literature and throw considerable light on the history of the Eastern Church from the beginnings of Christianity to the end of the Middle Ages. We have thought that a short sketch of the origin and scope of this important collection would be acceptable not only to the readers of *The Bulletin* but also to all those who are interested in the work of The Catholic University of America.

Like many other great enterprises the *Corpus Scriptorum* developed from humble and modest beginnings. About twelve years ago the Abbé Jouin, rector of the Church of St. Augustine in Paris, a poet of considerable reputation, wished to make use of a hymn contained in the works of St. Ephrem, one of the most celebrated Fathers of the Syrian Church. As this document was still unedited, he asked the Rev. Dr. Chabot, a distinguished Orientalist, to interpret it for him. So struck was the learned Abbé with the beauty and depth of thought which the translation revealed to him that he said to his friend: "Semitic scholars spend much time on Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions and records, which are of immediate interest only for profane history, when they could devote it much more profitably to the writings of the Eastern Fathers which contain so much valuable information concerning the doctrines and institutions of the early Church. The Abbé Migne gave us the Greek and Latin Patrologies which render immense service to students of Church History and Dogmatic Theology; why do you not follow his example, edit an Ori-

ental Patrology, and, by means of a good Latin translation, place within the reach of those who are not familiar with Semitic languages the incomparable Christian literature that lies hidden away and forgotten in the great libraries of Europe and America? Surely no document, that can shed any light on the development of Christianity, should be a matter of indifference to the world." Dr. Chabot remarked that a task of such magnitude and difficulty would necessarily involve a vast expenditure of labor and money, that enthusiasm and good will were not sufficient, that he who would build a monument should first of all compute the cost. The good Abbé, undismayed by these objections, urged his friend to begin the work and asured him that he and others were ready to help in a financial way until the publication could be made self-supporting.

Encouraged by the kind words of Abbé Jouin and the advice of the Marquis Melchior de Vogüé, one of the foremost archaeologists of modern times, Dr. Chabot decided to organize his Oriental Patrology. He was especially fitted for such a work. After graduating as Doctor of Theology from the University of Louvain in 1892, he devoted himself to Syriac literature and Semitic epigraphy. His writings, up to the present, constitute a small library in themselves. Among them we may mention: *The Life of Isaac of Niniveh,* a doctorate dissertation, *The Chronicle of Denys of Tell-Mare, The Commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Gospel of St. John, The History of the patriarch Iaballaha III, The Synodicon Orientale* or Collection of the Canons of the Nestorian Church, and especially his edition of the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian,* a work of the utmost importance for the history of the Arabs at the time of the Crusades. Besides these publications he has contributed many important articles to scientific periodicals and he is actually preparing a volume for the Corpus of Semitic Inscriptions. In recognition of his achievements in the field of Christian literature the French Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres bestowed upon him in 1910 its highest award, the Jean Reynaud prize, of the value of ten thousand francs.

Thus, Dr. Chabot was well qualified by training and experience to organize the Collection of Oriental Christian Writers. In January 1903 he sent a circular to many prominent Orientalists outlining his plans and soliciting their co-operation. Though he

held out no immediate prospect of pecuniary remuneration, it must be said to the honor and disinterestedness of science that a large number of scholars volunteered their services and promised to contribute one or more volumes to the Collection. Among those who first responded to his appeal four deserve a special notice here, for they became with him the directors of the Corpus and for the last ten years have given liberally of their time and means to further its success: Dr. Hyvernat of The Catholic University of America, Ignazio Guidi of the Sapienza University in Rome, Baron Carra de Vaux of the Institut of Paris, and Father Cheikho, S. J. of the University of Beirut in Syria. Dr. Hyvernat took charge of the Coptic section of the Corpus. No man was better fitted for the task. After receiving the degree of Doctor of Theology from the Pontifical University at Rome he turned his attention to Oriental studies and made a specialty of Coptic language and literature. He was professor of Assyriology and Egyptology in the Schools of St. Apollinare from 1885 to 1887 and Interpreter for Syriac, Coptic and Arabic, at the Propaganda until 1888. During the year 1888-1889 he was sent by the French government on a scientific mission to Armenia and the East. In this journey he was accompanied by his friend Mgr. Muller-Simonis of Strasburg, and the two travelers related their experiences and discoveries in their book entitled *Du Caucase au Golfe Persique,* Paris, 1889. During his sojourn in the Eternal City, Dr. Hyvernat published *The Acts of the Martyrs of Egypt* and *An Album of Coptic Palaeography* in which he gives photographic specimens from the most important Coptic MSS. in the different libraries of Europe. This Album is considered as one of the foundation-stones of Coptic Palaeography. In 1889 Dr. Hyvernat was called by Bishop Keane to THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA to organize the department of Egyptian and Semitic languages and literatures. In the midst of his professorial duties he has found time to publish two very important works: *A Short Introduction to the Hebrew Massora* and *A Study on the Coptic Versions of the Church of Egypt.* Under his constant care and supervision the Oriental department of THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA has reached a high degree of efficiency and the students have at their disposal his magnificent private library which contains about 12,000 volumes and pamphlets on Oriental literatures and cognate subjects besides a good number of MSS. Syriac, Persian,

Arabic, Turkish and Armenian. Most of these are still unpublished and offer splendid opportunities for personal research.

Ignazio Guidi, who was entrusted with the Ethiopic section of the Corpus, needs no introduction to the scientific world. He is universally considered as one of the best all around Orientalists of the present generation, and in the last thirty years no one has done more for the advancement of Oriental Christian literature. Gifted with an extraordinary ability for Semitic and modern languages he has contributed articles in Italian, French and German, to the best periodicals of Europe. He has made a special study of Arabic and Ethiopic and he is today the foremost authority on Amharic, the modern representative of the Old Ethiopic. Dr. Guidi has published many of the Syriac and Ethiopic volumes of the Corpus, besides an elementary Amharic Grammar and an Amharic-Italian Dictionary.

Baron Carra de Vaux, who first took charge of the Arabic section of the Corpus and Father Cheikho who succeeded him in the same capacity, have done excellent work in this department of Semitic studies. The former is well-known for several important contributions to Arabic philology and philosophy especially his *Avicenna* published in the series *Les Grands Philosophes;* the latter has written an elementary Arabic Grammar and has edited a splendid Arabic Chrestomathy entitled *Magani* or *Flowers from Arabic Literature.*

Such were the men first associated with Dr. Chabot in the management of the Collection of Oriental Christian Writers. In order to introduce method and system in the work they divided each Oriental literature into several groups or series and resolved to translate all the Oriental texts into Latin so as to make them accessible to students who are not acquainted with Semitic languages. The Syriac section was distributed into four groups: I. Apocryphal Books, Liturgy and Canon Law; II. Philosophy, Theology and Exegesis; III. History and Hagiography; IV. Documents of foreign origin especially translations from the Greek. Of this section, which will include about two hundred volumes, the following have appeared: *The Minor Chronicles; Documents related to the origins of the Monophysites; The Treatises of Philoxenus on the Trinity and the Incarnation; The Letters of the Patriarch Iesuyab III; The Commentaries of Denys bar Salibi on the Liturgy, on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the*

Apocalypse and the Catholic Epistles; The Opus Chronologicum of Elias of Nisibis; The Lives of the Most Illustrious Monophysites; The Syriac text of the *Scholia of Theodore Bar Koni* and of the *Commentary of St. Cyril of Alexandria on the Gospel of St. John.*

The Arabic section is made up of three series: I. Apocryphal Literature, Liturgy and Canon Law; II. Exegesis, Philosophy and Theology; III. History and Hagiography—in all about seventy volumes. Of these have been edited: *The Oriental History of Peter ibn Rahib, The Universal History of Agapius of Mabbogh. The Annals of Eutychius,* and *The Synaxary of the Church of Alexandria.* The Ethiopic section is divided into two groups: I. Apocryphal Books, Canon Law, Liturgy, Philosophy and Theology; II. History and Hagiography. Sixteen volumes from this section have been published so far: *The Apocryphal Documents concerning the Blessed Virgin; The Abyssinian Philosophers; The History of King Sarsa Dengel, The Annals of Kings John I, Iyasu I and Bakaffa; The Annals of Kings Iyasu II and Iyo'as; Documents Relating to Abysinian History* and the following *Acta Martyrum: SS. Yared and Pantalewon; SS. Michael and Anorewos; SS. Aaron and Philip; St. Eustathius; St. Mercurius; SS. Fere Michael and Zara Abrahm; SS. Abekerazum and Harrawayat and St. Wallatta Petros.* Coptic literature forms three series: I. Apocryphal Books and Liturgy; II. Theology; II. History and Hagiography—in all about fifty volumes. The important collection of Coptic MSS. acquired by the late J. Pierpont Morgan, which will be mentioned later in this notice, will be edited in the *Corpus* and will constitute a special series of about fifty volumes known as the *Series Morganiana.* Of the Coptic section four volumes have appeared: one of the *Acts of the Martyrs,* one of the *Life,* and two of the *Works of Shenouti* who, next to Pachomius, was the most famous leader of cenobitism and undoubtedly the most prolific and forceful writer of the Coptic Church.

Thus since the year 1903 the editors of the Corpus have published over forty numbers, each number constituting two volumes, one of text and one of Latin translation. It is worthy of note that the work done has elicited admiration and praise in all quarters; the volumes have been very favorably reviewed, and the constantly increasing number of subscriptions shows that this Collection is supplying a real need in the world of letters. Up to

the year 1912 the *Corpus Scriptorum* was merely a private enterprise under the control and management of Drs. Chabot, Hyvernat and Guidi. Thanks to their self-sacrifice and scientific prestige it now enjoys a world-wide reputation. However, the editors foresaw that, in spite of their zeal and enthusiasm, they would not be able, of themselves, to complete such a vast collection. They had given the example and shown the way; it was time for others to take up a part of the burden. They feared too, that, in the event of their demise, the publication might be discontinued. Hence in the beginning of the year 1912 they appealed to the authorities of The University of Louvain and The Catholic University of America and asked them to take charge of the *Corpus Scriptorum* so as to insure its continuance, its more rapid progress and ultimate completion. They pointed out that the Collection was almost self-supporting, that subscriptions were on the increase, and that the two universities not only would run no financial risk but would eventualy derive much profit from the undertaking. They would enrich their libraries with photographs of Oriental manuscripts, they could exchange the volumes of the *Corpus* for other great publications which are very expensive when purchased outright, and would be in a position to do for the cause of Oriental literature what the Academies of Berlin and Vienna are doing by their editions of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

This project was formally presented to the authorities of the two universities and accepted by them with enthusiasm. Articles were drawn up by which the editors surrendered their rights and interests so that now the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* is the property of the two universities and is being published under their joint responsibility. There is no doubt that these two great centers of learning have both the means and ability to carry on this important work with success. The University of Louvain enjoys the prestige which attaches to an excellent institution of long standing and counts among its professors and graduates a large number of distinguished Orientalists. The Catholic University of America, though only in the twenty-fifth year of its existence, has won the admiration, respect and confidence of men of all classes and creeds; it has a well-equipped department of Semitic languages and literatures and numbers four Orientalists among its professors and eight among its graduates. Furthermore the *Corpus Scriptorum* will remain under the editorial charge of

its former owners, Drs. Chabot, Guidi and Hyvernat. With them is now associated Dr. Forget of Louvain, well-known for many excellent contributions to Arabic literature and for his edition of the Synaxary of the Alexandrian Church, who has assumed the direction of the Arabic section of the *Corpus*. The rectors of the two Universities and the present editors are assisted by two committees, one in Louvain and one in Washington, the former consisting of Drs. Van Hoonacker, Coppieters, Lefort and Lebon, and the latter of Drs. Cöln, Butin and Vaschalde. Circulars have been sent to all institutions of learning formally announcing the transfer of the *Corpus Scriptorum* and asking the coöperation and support of all those who are interested in the diffusion of Christian literature.

The preceding historical sketch is sufficient to show that the *Corpus Scriptorum* is a colossal undertaking the importance of which cannot be overestimated. It will prove a veritable mine of information for the different departments of Oriental literature and ecclesiastical science especially for Philology, Biblical studies, Philosophy, Dogmatic Theology, Church History, Liturgy and Canon Law, as was pointed out in the *Catholic University Bulletin* (Dec. 1911). However, the *Corpus Scriptorum* has recently assumed additional importance from the fact that the rich collection of fifty Coptic manuscripts found in the ruins of the Monastery of St. Michael in the Fayyum and acquired by the late J. Pierpont Morgan, will be published as a special series of its Coptic section under the supervision of Dr. Hyvernat of The Catholic University. Although much has been written in newspapers and reviews concerning this wonderful collection, it will be well to point out its significance in the field of Coptic studies.

The greater part of the Coptic literary remains, which we hitherto possessed, have come down to us in a most wretched condition. The ancient manuscripts, which escaped the pillage and destruction of the Egyptian monasteries in the Middle Ages, have partly perished owing to the indifference, carelessness, or ignorance of their possessors when Arabic supplanted Coptic as the vernacular and literary speech of the country. When, in the eighteenth century, European scholars and travelers began to search for those literary treasures, Coptic manuscripts acquired some commercial value in the eyes of their owners but their condition was not thereby improved. It became a custom with the Arabs,

who had Coptic manuscripts to sell, to divide them into several portions, to distribute the leaves among the different families of the tribe and dispose of them piecemeal in the hope of securing a higher price for them. Thus the Vatican Library, the British Museum of London and the National Library of Paris, have come into possession of fragments which originally belonged to the same manuscript. When it is question of biblical texts such scattered fragments may often be identified and grouped together, but in the case of historical or theological documents reconstruction is well-nigh impossible. It is very probable that the Fayyum Collection would have gone the way of all the others but for the energy of Dr. Chassinat, director of the French Institute of Archaeology at Cairo, who persuaded an antiquarian to buy all these manuscripts at any cost. Thus fifty of them found their way to Paris where they were purchased by the late J. Pierpont Morgan in December, 1911. Five of them still remain in the Egyptian Museum at Cairo.

The discovery of the Fayyum manuscripts and their purchase by one of America's most distinguished sons are two important events in the annals of Coptic studies. Scholars agree in saying that the Morgan Collection is the most complete collection of Coptic manuscripts ever brought together. Forty-seven of them are written in Sahidic or dialect of Upper Egypt, one in Bohairic or dialect of the Delta, and the other two in Fayyumic the dialect of the province in which the collection was found. They are remarkable first for their age and provenance. Twenty of them are dated: three from the beginning of the tenth century (903, 906, 914), four belong to the year 893 and thirteen range from 893 to 823. This latter date is the earliest yet found in any dated Coptic manuscript and is anterior by thirty-nine years to the date of the oldest dated Greek uncial manuscript (862). Hence from the standpoint of Coptic palaeography the collection is invaluable and will supplement the Album of Coptic Palaeography published by Hyvernat in 1888. The provenance of these manuscripts is of great historical interest. The fact that they were all written in the Fayyum, as appears from the colophons of the scribes, shows that the Sahidic dialect had become the literary speech of that province as early as the ninth or eighth century, and since all the colophons are in the Fayyumic dialect we may conclude that this dialect still obtained as a spoken language.

Another important feature of the Morgan manuscripts is that many of them have preserved their original bindings which are possibly the oldest and, at any rate, the best authenticated specimens of the art of book-binding among the Copts. These bindings consist of coarse boards about half an inch thick made of layers of papyrus sheets taken from older manuscripts. The covers are in brown leather stamped with geometrical designs and cut through so as to allow the insertion of gems and precious stones. In one case the decoration is obtained by means of narrow strips of red leather delicately stitched in the cover. It was the custom of the Egyptian scribes to paint the large letters, to adorn the titles of books and chapters with multicolored figures, and to fill up the margins with drawings of flowers, birds and quadrupeds. Most of the Morgan manuscripts abound in this style of illumination; but more interesting still is the fact that a dozen of them contain full page miniatures representing the Blessed Virgin with her divine Son, angels, martyrs, anchorites, and other saints. This is important for the history of the art of manuscript illuminating, for so far no miniatures had been found in Coptic manuscripts anterior to the eleventh century.

However, the priceless value of this collection lies in the nature of its documents. Like all monastic libraries of the early times it includes three chief kinds of works: biblical books, liturgical writings, and theological treatises. The Old Testament is represented by six complete books of which we had only fragments of uncertain age and provenance: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, I and II Kings, and Isaias. Of the New Testament it contains Matthew, Mark, John, all complete; Luke with about eight chapters missing (iv. 33-ix. 30; ix. 12-xiii. 17); the fourteen epistles of St. Paul and seven Catholic Epistles (I and II Peter, I, II, III John, James, and Jude). Thus we have at last a few complete books of the Bible that present a definite Sahidic recension at a given time of Coptic history. The Bohairic New Testament is represented by a single manuscript of the four Gospels; unfortunately it has many lacunae, but nevertheless, it may have considerable critical value as it is one of the oldest, if not the oldest copy of the four Gospels in that dialect.

Liturgical literature is represented only by three documents but they are most precious and unique. They are: A complete Lectionary containing valuable information as to the sanctoral and the

general arrangement of ecclesiastical feasts throughout the year; a Breviary and an Antiphonary, two works of which we had only a few fragments that challenged all attempts at reconstruction. The Collection is rich in theological and hagiographical material. Of the writings of the native theologians it contains a volume of Shenouti and different treatises by John of Ashmounein, Basil of Pemge, Constantine of Siout, Stephen of Henes, Macarius of Tkoou, and translations of some writings of the patriarchs of Alexandria: Peter, Theophilus, Cyril, Theodore, Isaac and especially Athanasius. There are also translations of some of the works of the Greek Fathers: Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Severus of Antioch and others. All these works were evidently the best known to the Egyptian monks and must have been copied very frequently; thanks to the complete copies of the collection critics will be able to identify a great number of theological fragments scattered through the different European collections.

It was the wish of the late J. Pierpont Morgan that his collection of Coptic manuscripts should, as soon as possible, be made available to scholars and students. We are glad to inform our readers that work on this collection has been progressing steadily ever since The Catholic University of America was entrusted with its publication. Dr. Hyvernat is writing a descriptive catalogue of the collection which will be of great importance for Coptic palaeography. Four volumes of the collection are now in preparation and will be published after the appearance of the catalogue: *The Gospels* by Sir Ernest Thompson, *Isaias* by Mgr. Hebbelynck, *I and II Kings* by Dieu, *The Works of Samuel of Kalamon,* by Van Cawenberg, and*The Book of Hermenias* or *Antiphonary* by Drs. Hyvernat and Vaschalde. The remaining volumes will be edited as rapidly as is consistent with sound scholarship.

A. VASCHALDE.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Dr. Hyvernat has returned to the University from a six or seven months stay in Europe. A considerable portion of that time was spent by him in research in the various libraries of Europe in connection with his work on the Morgan collection of Coptic MSS. The principal Coptic collections visited by him were those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; British Museum, London; John Rylands Library, Manchester; University Library, Strassburg; University Library, Freiburg i. B.; University Library, Heidelberg; the Royal Library of Venice; the Ambrosian Library of Milan and the Vatican Library in Rome. Dr. Hyvernat was received everywhere with the greatest courtesy: everybody seemed anxious to help him bring out as soon, and in as perfect a manner, as possible, the catalogue of what is justly considered the most complete collection of Coptic MSS. ever discovered. As already noted in the *Bulletin* this collection consists of fifty complete or almost complete MSS. and various fragments. Thirty of these MSS. have their original bindings, more or less completely preserved. Not any two of these exhibit the same patterns. It is hardly necessary to add that such a collection of bindings is entirely unique. It is a most complete illustration of the technique of book-binding from the fifth to the tenth century of our era. Yet this is but one aspect of this wonderful collection, which is no less remarkable for its primitive style of miniatures and vastly more so for its paleographical and literary value. Most of the documents it contains are entirely new and with few exceptions, the others were known from fragments only. Dr. Hyvernat is now engaged in classifying and studying, with the assistance of his library the immense material he has accumulated during this last and his preceding trips abroad. The entire collection, as our readers know, will be published in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*. Several volumes are already in preparation, and will be published as soon as the catalogue is

out. Dr. Hyvernat has secured as contributors to this huge undertaking the best Coptic scholars both in Europe and in America.

Dr. Hyvernat has resumed the direction of his Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures, which has become the American home of the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.*

Spiritual Retreat. The annual spiritual retreat for the ecclesiastical students of the University began at 8 p. m., on Wednesday, February 25th, and closed on Monday morning, March first. It was conducted by Most Reverend James J. Keane, D. D., Archbishop of Dubuque. The spiritual retreat for lay students, conducted by Rev. Godfrey Hunt, O. F. M., began on Friday, February 27th, and ended on Sunday, March first.

Feast of St. Thomas. The Patronal Feast of the Faculty of Philosophy was celebrated by a High Mass in the chapel of Gibbons Hall on Saturday, March 7th, at 10.30 a. m. The celebrant was the Very Reverend John Spensley, D. D., President of Gibbons Hall. At 4.30 p. m. a lecture was given on "St. Thomas and Social Justice" by Rev. James J. Fox, D. D.

Knights of Columbus Scholarships. Forms of application for these Scholarships have been sent out to the different colleges. The details, such as time, place, etc., of the examinations will be made known not later than April 15. Meantime, the following regulations governing the granting of the Scholarships have been promulgated by the University.

The Fifty Graduate Scholarships founded in the Catholic University of America by the Knights of Columbus are now open, where practical, to competitive examination.

I. Only young laymen who have obtained the degree Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or a corresponding degree, are eligible to these scholarships. Bachelors of Law must have previously obtained the A. B. degree.

II. Applicants must be, by preference, Knights of Columbus, or sons of members of the Order, and must contemplate going on for the Master's or Doctor's degree in the Schools of Philosophy, Sciences, Letters, or Law.

III. These scholarships furnish board, lodging, and tuition, during the time prescribed for the aforesaid degrees. All other expenses, laboratory fees, etc., are at the charge of the student.

IV. Forms of application may be obtained from Rt. Rev Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University. These forms call for the full name of the applicant and correct address; place and date of birth; accurate record of primary school, high school, and collegiate education. The candidate should also state the principal study which he desires to take up.

V. The candidate must present three certificates: (a) From the Grand Knight of his Council attesting his right to compete; (b) from his parish priest attesting good moral conduct; (c) from the President or Secretary of his college attesting the graduate degree received.

VI. Applications will be received by the Rector of the University until April 1, after which date the exact time, place, and conditions of the examination will be communicated to all eligible applicants..

VII. Graduate students of the current year may take the examination, but must have obtained the requisite degree before entering the University.

VIII. The successful candidates must present themselves at the University on the opening day of the scholastic year, September 29, 1914.